

Gender Reality vs. Gender Ideology
Gender Colloquium at UNDA
Sydney, Australia
July 2, 2013
Sr. Prudence Allen, RSM, PhD
St. John Vianney Theological Seminary
Denver, Colorado

Introduction to the Present Conflict Between Gender Reality and Gender Ideology

The Realization of Gender: Distinction between Concept of Gender and Word 'Gender'

Historical Development of Concept of Gender

Historical Development of Word 'Gender'

Alfred Kinsey's Proactive Eroticism of the Concept and Word 'Sex'

Margaret Mead's Reduction of Males and Females to Sex and Gender Roles

The Medicalization of Gender: John Money and the Roots of Gender Ideology

Arguing from the Exception to the Rule about the Gender Gate

Arguing from Artificial Division Gender-Identity/Role (G-I/R)

Arguing from Multiple Parts (sexes and genders) to Whole

Proactive Eroticism of Human Relations

Characteristics of the Roots of Gender Ideology

Introduction

The present conflict between what I call 'Gender Reality' and 'Gender Ideology' is the result of two different views of the human person. Gender Reality holds that human beings are 'always or for the most part' women or men, female or male. Gender Ideology holds that human beings fall along a continuum of 3, 5, or even 15 different loose group of genders. Gender Reality is rooted philosophically in a descriptive metaphysics (Aristotelian and Thomistically grounded) and Gender Ideology is philosophically rooted in a revisionary metaphysics (Neoplatonist or Cartesian founded).¹ Finally, Gender Reality depends upon a hylomorphic (soul/body unity)

¹ This distinction between descriptive and revisionary metaphysics comes from Peter F. Strawson, *Individuals* (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd. 1961), 9.

understanding of a human person, woman or man; Gender Ideology depends upon a deconstructionist approach to the human person as a loose collection of qualities, attributes, or accidents. Gender Reality is based on

Sk. v
to
p. 5

This conflict between Gender Reality and Gender Ideology is serious and in need of careful philosophical analysis. It began basically in the social sciences, and has spread through pseudo-sciences, and finally through journalists back into philosophy and theology. Few, if any, philosophers have grappled with the errors in reasoning and assumptions of various forms of gender ideology. This lack within the philosophical community has allowed harmful effects of Gender Ideology to roam freely and unfortunately to contribute to increase its influence within in the culture of death.

It is obvious to anyone today who fills out an application for university, makes a reservation to fly, or even applies for a visa to visit another country, that the category 'gender' is widely used with the two sub-categories of male or female to be checked off by the applicant. Recently third options, labeled as 'other', 'don't know', or 'neither' have appeared. The third category in these circumstances is a compassionate response to persons who are a very small minority of human beings in the general population and who suffer from not fitting into either male or female without some ambivalence.

The common-place use of the word 'gender' reveals that a major shift in language from *sex* to *gender* has occurred. In 1985 When Volume I of *The Concept of Woman: The Aristotelian Revolution (750BC-1250 AD)* was published in Montreal by Eden Press, I used the word 'sex' in my analysis of theories of respective identities of woman and man to indicate unisex, sex polarity, or sex complementarity. When this book was republished in paperback by Eerdmans in

1997, in the Preface to the second edition I included a rationale for leaving the word 'sex' in the original text along with a recognition of the emergence of the word 'gender' as applied to the respective identities of men and women.²

In 2002 when Volume II of *The Concept of Woman: The Early Humanist Reformation (1250-1500)* was published by Eerdmans, I changed from using the word 'sex' to the word 'gender to indicate the historical development in the concept of woman and in relation to man. By the end of the Renaissance the respective identities of women and men built upon and included their distinct sexual foundations as a female or a male. Theories of intergender relations were now identified as: gender unity, gender polarity (in traditional and reverse forms), and gender complementarity (in fractional and integral forms).³ The use of 'gender' captured more fully my own discoveries of the increasingly enriched dimensions of human consciousness about how a woman and how a man is engendered within a *hylomorphic* understanding of the human person as a *body/soul unity*.

In 2008, when I attended a Conference Sponsored by the Council for the Laity in Rome on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Pope John Paul II's Apostolic Letter, *Mulieris Dignitatem*, two excellent journalists, Marguerite A. Peeters and Dale O'Leary, offered strong arguments against using the word 'gender' because it had become tightly associated with a distorted understanding of different kinds of human identities. Their remarkable work of mapping the explosive force of gender ideology through the struggles to redefine 'gender' at

² See Sr. Prudence Allen, RSM, *The Concept of Woman: The Aristotelian Revolution (750BC-1250AD)* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985/1997), xx-xxi.

³ Sr. Prudence Allen, *The Concept of Woman: Volume II: The Early Humanist Reformation, 1250-1500* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 15-21.

international conferences, especially sponsored by the United Nations will be described in detail in Part II this paper. When I raised the question at the conference of whether we can ‘ransom’ gender, away from this new form of gender ideology towards a true understanding of gender reality, the ensuing discussion included arguments supporting on the one hand, that it was no longer possible to do so, and on the other hand, that it must be done through a theological and philosophical anthropology. Fortunately, the Church itself has left the question open for future research as they await a further clarification from scholars. In response to this openness I am offering this paper to defend the side of the argument which seeks to ransom the true meaning of gender reality consistent with the Catholic faith, but defended by reason as a philosopher is called to do by John Paul II in *Fides et ratio*.

Philosophers need to paid heed to this challenge for serious reasons which will become more evident below. To begin this process, I will trace the history of gender and its relation to sex, and identify central arguments put forth by gender ideologists. Where possible I will make preliminary judgments about errors, fallacies, or other distortions in these arguments. Finally, I will present my own argument for a proper approach to gender identity and its relation to sex identity, and will encourage philosophers and theologians to ransom gender from its current ideological pitfall.

This paper is divided into two parts: In Part I, I offer an historical explanation for how gender has been approached in Western thought, distinguishing the concept of gender from the word ‘gender’. Then I trace the recent history of the introduction of the core concept and word ‘gender’ into public discourse and show how it contained several elements of the ideology of gender. In Part II I trace the way in which Gender Ideology ‘went viral’ and sketch some

elements for a defense of gender reality as based on Theological Anthropology and Thomistic metaphysics.

Part I

The Realization of Gender: Distinction between Concept of Gender and Word 'Gender'

Historical Development of The Concept of Gender

→ In Western history, the root of the word 'gender' can be easily seen in Athens and Jerusalem. In Aristotle's Generation of Animals the Greek philosopher, using the philosophical method of observation of the senses and reason, attempted to explain how human generation occurred through the union of male and female. While he wrongly thought that women provided no fertile seed (not discovering ovulation), and he wrongly thought that men provided only one seed for each act of intercourse, Aristotle nonetheless understood the root of generation of 'gen' to be due the union of male and female, with the male generating outside the self and the female generating inside the self. This root 'gen' in generation evolved over time to the notion of gens which implies an intergenerational family group.

In the Book of Genesis, the author, drawing upon faith and reason, described the creation of the human being (man) as male and female. The root 'gen' in Hebrew, in addition to implying the beginning in Genesis 1, also implied through the book of Generations in Genesis 5, the beginning of the account of history, flowing from one generation to another. Ultimately this way of recording history led to the saving event of the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

While the philosophical use of the root 'gen' focused on how theories about how generation occurred through the cooperation of male and female, the theological use of the root 'gen' focused on why generation was so important to man, woman, God, and salvation history. We could say then that the seed for the concept of gender in Western thought was planted around two-thousand-five hundred years ago in Athens and in Jerusalem with the root 'gen.' In thinking about language, Heidegger observed that we should not be like buckets, which get filled with little bits of water and empty out, but rather "Words are wellsprings that are found and dug up in the telling, wellsprings that must be found and dug up again and again, that easily cave in, but that at times also well up when least expected..."⁴ I will argue that the deconstructed word 'gender' common to gender ideology is like the bucket, artificially made and easily emptied; and that the authentic root 'gen' in gender reality is a wellspring for the flourishing of the human person, women and men, and is essential for communion generation after generation in the human race.

My longitudinal study of the concept of woman in relation to man, reveals three distinct historical periods in the development of the concept of gender identity. In the first phase, lasting from 750BC-1450AD women and men were distinguished by the single reference point of female in relation to male. In the second period, from approximately 1450 to 1850, characteristics referred to as feminine and masculine were culturally identified, and applied to human beings, either with direct sex association as in masculine male or feminine female, or with indirect sex association as in masculine female or feminine male. These various masculine or

⁴ Martin Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking?* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), Part II, Lecture II, 130.

feminine characteristics exemplify different cultural concepts of gender. Often they were positively attributed to the opposite sex as in Petrarch's description of a woman whose dexterity, strength, courage, and patience are like 'like a powerful man.' And sometimes they were negatively attributed to the opposite sex as in satirical attributions to effeminate men.⁵ This development can be understood as analogous to moving from a single point reference to a flat triangular model of female, feminine, masculine and male, masculine, feminine.⁶

The third development of the *concept* of gender began in the nineteenth century and has lasted until the present. Drawing from principles of existentialism and personalism, a woman or a man are described as self-defining to the extent that each one selects which characteristics to integrate into one's own personality. Simply stated, a woman could think I want to be (or do not want to be) like my aunt, mother, teacher, etc. with respect to characteristic a, b, or c; and a man think I want to be (or do not want to be) like my father, uncle, teacher, etc with respect Here the person can be seen as analogous to a three-dimensional being, with interior space who decides which culturally feminine or masculine characteristics to integrate with their foundational female or male identity. In the early 20th century authors like Edith Stein or Karl Jung made the argument that either a woman or a man could integrate both masculine and feminine characteristics. However, in the later 20th century Karol Wojtyla/John Paul II made convincing arguments that only females have feminine characteristics, namely in the way each woman acts in the world; and only males have masculine characteristics, namely in the way each man acts in the world. In addition, John Paul II argued further that the meaning of a woman's femininity is

⁵ Allen, *The Concept of Woman, The Early Humanist Reformation*, 273 and 849-50.

⁶ Allen, *The Concept of Woman, The Early Humanist Reformation*, 15-21.

fulfilled in spiritual/or biological *maternity*; and the *meaning* of a man's masculinity is fulfilled in spiritual and/or biological *paternity*.⁷

In this three-phased historical development of the *concept* of gender, sex identity in a female or male human being is *integrated* respectively by the human person *qua* woman or *qua* man. The man has a substantial identity as male who engenders masculine characteristics and a woman has a substantial identity as female person, who engenders feminine characteristics in a unique way. The challenge for philosophy and theology is to identify which characteristics are culturally stereotyped and which are more foundational to the identity of a woman or a man. This task of philosophy and theology occurs in the context of the social sciences, whose scholars describe roles or other characteristics without sufficient critique. To begin this kind of critique I will distinguish between the *word* 'gender' and the *concept* of gender.

Historical Development of the Word 'Gender'

The *word* 'gender' has a different *developmental time-line* than the *concept* of gender. The pre-Socratic sophist Protagoras (490-420BC) introduced the *link* between *language* and *masculine, feminine, and neutral kinds of words*, but he *did not use* the word 'gender.' Nearly a millennium later, the NeoPlatonist Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464) introduced a theory within which *masculinity and femininity* operated within a '*coincidence of opposites*', and *masculine and feminine* had *intellectual independence* from bodily distinctions of male and female.

⁷ See, for instance, John Paul II, *Man and Woman: He Created Them, A Theology of the Body*, trans. Michael Waldstein (Boston: Pauline Books and Media, 2006), General Audience of March 12, 1980, 21:2, p. 210-11 and General Audience of March 26, 1980, 22:5-6, pp. 216-18.

A century later satirical literature began to explore the intersection of language with male and female identity in the infamous 1595 *Disputatio nova contra mulieres, qua probatur eas homines non esse* [A New Disputation Against Women, Which Proves that They are Not Human]. This satire contains 50 repeated *reductio ad absurdum* arguments as a simultaneous parody on scholastic disputation among Catholic scholars (referred to as Papists) and Biblical literalists (referred to as Anabaptists) written by an author with a Lutheran background. This satire was refuted in 1641 in 'Defense of the Female sex' by Simon Gedicci, S.T.D and the two arguments together were reprinted up to the end of the 18th century. In 1938 Dorothy Sayers offered a further refutation on the theme of the relation of women, men and the human in, *Are Women Human?: Astute and Witty Essays on the Role of Women in Society*.

The first literary work I have found that uses the word 'gender' directly to describe distinctions between a woman and a man is the 1620 satirical text published in England entitled *Hic Mulier*. The anonymous author of this pamphlet rather extraordinarily links the English words *genders* and *generations* to women's identity in a way that anticipates the twentieth-century application of the word 'gender' to a woman's and a man's respective identities.

For since the days of Adam women were never so masculine; masculine in their *genders* and whole *generations*, from the Mother, to the youngest daughter; masculine in number, from one to multitudes; masculine in case, even from the head to the foot; masculine in mood, from both speech, to impudent action; and masculine in tense: for (without redress) they were, are, and will be still most masculine, most mankind, and most monstrous.⁸

⁸ *Hic Mulier*, A3, in Henderson and McManus, 265. Italics and bold my emphasis.

This satire not only joins the linguistic categories of masculine and feminine endings directly to men's and women's identities, but also the linguistic categories of number, case, mood, and tense to various aspects of a woman's identity.

Haec Vir is the second of the three satirical pamphlets focusing on man-woman identities. Its full title captures well its purpose and method: *Haec-Vir: Or The Womanish-Man: Being an answer to a late Book intituled Hic-Mulier. Exprest in a briefe Dialogue between Haec-Vir the Womanish-Man, and Hic-Mulier the Man-Woman.* This satire begins with both the woman and the man assuming falsely the gender of the other one—the man thinking he is talking to a man, instead of a woman; and the woman thinking she is talking to a woman, instead of a man. The reasons for these errors are the clothes and bearing of the bodies of the persons being addressed. It is generally assumed that satirizing a masculine woman and a feminine man were directly associated with the personas of Queen Victoria and King James.

In C.S. Lewis's, *Perelandra*, written in 1943 as part of his science fiction trilogy, the narrator (who is thought to be Lewis himself) reflects on the meaning of "gender" and its relation to "sex":

Gender is a reality, and a more fundamental reality than sex. Sex is, in fact, merely the adaptation to organic life of a fundamental polarity which divides all created beings. **Female sex is simply one of the things that have feminine gender**; there are many others, and Masculine and Feminine meet us on planes of reality where male and female would be simply meaningless. Masculine is not attenuated male and female attenuated female. On the contrary, the male and female of organic creatures are rather faint and blurred reflections of masculine and feminine.⁹

The Neoplatonic text *The Cosmographia* of Bernardus Silvestris is commonly thought to be the source for *Perelandra* and the other texts in his Space Trilogy. The Neoplatonic author Cardinal

⁹ C.S. Lewis, *Perelandra: A Novel* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944), 214.

Nicolas of Cusa had also used abstract complement concepts of cosmic masculine and feminine.¹⁰

Alfred Kinsey's Proactive Eroticism of Sex

Dr. Alfred Kinsey (1894-1956), an entomologist, earned his PhD from Harvard University studying Gall Wasps. His original orientation towards animals and particularly insects, framed his attitude towards human beings as simply another kind of animal.¹¹ Even though he was raised in a Protestant (Methodist) family, Kinsey had totally rejected belief in spiritual realities and especially the view that the human soul was both form and spirit.¹² Consequently, when he became part of an interdisciplinary course on sexuality and marriage at Indiana University, he was interested only in studying sexual activity as a human 'outlet', to use the word that characterized all his research.¹³

¹⁰ See Allen, *The Concept of Woman*, Volume II, 762-88.

¹¹ See Lionel Trilling, "The Kinsey Report," in Donald Porter Geddes, ed., *An Analysis of the Kinsey Reports on Sexual Behavior in the Human Male and Female* (New York: Mentor Books, 1954), 213-229. Trilling observes that while comparisons with animals is explicitly made through out his two volumes on males and females, "Professor Kinsey is a zoologist and he properly keeps us always in mind of our animal kinship, even though he draws some very illogical conclusions from it;...", 218.

¹² Wardell B. Pomeroy reports the following incident with Kinsey's 4-5 year old son Bruce when he said: "'Look at the pretty flower, Daddy, God made it.' 'Now Bruce,' Kinsey said gently, 'where did that flower really come from?' From a seed,' Bruce admitted. He had learned his father's lessons well.", *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research* (New York, Evanston, San Francisco, London: Harper & Row, 1972), 29.

¹³ Consider just the titles of his chapters in Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia and London: W.B. Saunders Company, 1948), Part II: Factors Affecting Sexual Outlet, 6: Sexual Outlet, 7: Age and Sexual Outlet, 8: Marital Status and Sexual Outlet, 9. Age of Adolescence and Sexual Outlet, 10: Social

Kinsey decided to quantify all aspects of a man's, woman's, and child's sexual 'outlets', by age, the size of organ and frequency of 'outlets' without being concerned whether the so-called 'outlet' occurred with the person alone, with members of the same or opposite sex, with animals, or with children. He included in his classification systems of men, any and all who would agree to give their sexual history in a detailed interview. The groups included serial rapists in prison, pedophiles, single men, married men, male prostitutes, and so on. Kinsey included in his classification systems of married women, and women in common law relations as well as female prostitutes living with their handlers.¹⁴ These mixed groups tended to distort normal ranges of sexual activities; and served to 'push' counselors, psychologists, and others to consider why someone fell significantly below the 'so-called' normal number of incidents of sexual activities.¹⁵

In addition to the distorted data groups with large numbers of persons from criminal or mentally aberrant groups exceeding those from groups of ordinary women and men, Dr. Kinsey had a utilitarian requirement for everyone who wanted to hear a lecture or have some other favor

Level and Sexual Outlet; 12: Rural-Urban Background and Sexual Outlet, 13: Religious Background and Sexual Outlet ; and Part III: Sources of Sexual Outlet. xii-xv.

¹⁴ See Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell B. Pomeroy, Clyde E. Martin, Paul H. Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia and London: W.B. Saunders Company, 1953) and Paul H. Gebhard and Alan B. Johnson, *The Kinsey Data: Marginal Tabulations of the 1938-1963 Interviews Conducted by the Institute for Sex Research* (Philadelphia/London/Toronto: W.B.Saunders Company, 1979).

¹⁵ See Judith A. Reisman, *Kinsey: Crimes & Consequences (The Red Queen & The Grand Scheme)* (Arlington. Virginia: The Institute for Media Education, Inc., 1998), especially 'The Sample', and 'Statistical Confusion or Deception', 52-58 and 'Kinsey's Statistical Stuff, non-sense, and control,' 265-67.

from him such as employment, to agree to give an interview sex history.¹⁶ The interview techniques involved frequent use of what philosophers call 'the fallacy of a complex question', i.e., "trying to support a proposition with an argument in which that proposition is a premise."¹⁷ The interviewer would ask 'When did you start ____ sexual activity?' and this question would be repeated frequently even when the person denied they had ever done that particular act. Kinsey's associate Pomeroy described it this way: "We also never asked *whether* a subject had ever engaged in a particular activity; we assumed that everyone had engaged in everything, and so we began by asking *when* he had done it."¹⁸

When the volume on *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* was published in 1948 with its initial claim of being based on interviews with '12000' males and the volume on *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* in 1953 with its claim of being based on interviews with 'nearly 8000 females' it had the force in the popular culture of authority of numbers. This, however, echoed another fallacy, the appeal to majority, i.e., "using the fact that large numbers of people believe a

¹⁶ For interviewing techniques see, Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in The Human Male*, 35-62; Gebhard, *The Kinsey Data*, 11-24; Wardell B. Pomeroy, Dr. Kinsey and The Institute for Sex Research, 97-137); and for critique of interviewing techniques see Reisman, *Kinsey: Crimes & Consequences*, 28-31; 58-63 and 211 ff.

¹⁷ See 'Fallacies' in David Kelley, *The Art of Reasoning* (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1988), Chapter 6, here 133.

¹⁸ Pomeroy, *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research*, 112. This fallacious approach to interviewing was pursued indefinitely. For example, Pomeroy adds: "If a subject was of low mentality we might pretend that we had misunderstood his negative reply, and ask another question as though he had answered affirmatively; for instance, 'Yes, I know you have never done that, but how old were you the *first* time you did it?' To make it as easy as possible for subjects to correct their answers, we ignored contradictions, accepting the correction as though it were a first reply", 113.

proposition to be true as evidence of its truth".¹⁹ Even though Kinsey revised his numbers down by claiming that he 'scientifically-conducted' interviews with 5,300 men and 5,940 women, it was widely received in the broader culture as describing the truth about human sexuality separated from any context of love, marriage, or human good. The publication of the first volume became a best seller. According to Pomeroy, "... by the time Kinsey died there had been eleven printings of the Male volume..., and the book was translated into French, Spanish, Swedish, Japanese, Italian, Dutch and German."²⁰ Kinsey's report of the 'usual numbers' of sexual outlets in various population groups had a strong influence on many not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Three aspects of Kinsey's analysis have particular significance for our topic of gender reality vs. gender ideology. The first concerns his reduction of the identity of the whole human person to sexual acts. In other words, Kinsey reduced sex identity, traditional classified as differentiated male and female human beings, to sexual activity, reduced primarily to a quantified 'sexual outlet' and secondarily reduced to a variety of 'objects' along a continuum of male and female, humans and animals. Lionel Trilling describes it this way: "The Report never suggests that a sexual experience is anything but the discharge of specifically sexual tension and therefore seems to conclude that frequency is always the sign of a robust sexuality."²¹ This reductionist

¹⁹ Kelley, *The Art of Reasoning*, 133.

²⁰ Pomeroy, *Kinsey and the Institute*, 274. An immediate critique from the perspective of broader human values and sexual activity with respect to the Kinsey reports, can be found in Donald Porter Geddes, ed., *An Analysis of the Kinsey Reports on Sexual Behavior in the Human Male and Female* (New York, Mentor Books, 1954).

²¹ Trilling, "The Kinsey Report," 220.

approach of Kinsey ignores the psyche and the spirit of the individual human person. Again Trilling captures this reductionism: “The emphasis on the anatomical and physiological nature of sexuality is connected with the Report’s strong reliance on animal behavior as a norm.”²²

A ²second aspect of Kinsey’s work was the description of persons as ‘objects’ rather than subjects of sexual activity. This is an obvious utilitarian use of the person and a reduction of that person from a loved ‘someone’ to a used ‘something.’²³ The reports made no connection between sexual activity and the generation of children, and specifically of women with their experience of maternity. The reports also seemed to encourage sexual activity outside of marriage, breaking promises of fidelity for experiences with prostitutes, homosexual partners, and other heterosexual spouses. It suggested that adults ‘need’ this kind of variety for their ‘sexual outlets’.

A third aspect of Kinsey’s work was a focus on children’s sexual activity, and his promotion of it as healthy and unharmed even when initiated by adults. His reports contained clear sections of data which quantified sexual arousal in children from 0-8 years, citing that they were stimulated by an adult. Even though Kinsey was careful to mention that one of the child’s parents was always in the room, there is no doubt that a kind of pedophilia behavior was occurring even behind a screen of scientific research. Kinsey also argued that early sexual activity in children, in analogy with animals, was a better preparation for successful activity in adults.²⁴ A recent article in the *Ave Maria International Law Journal* has demonstrated the link

²² Trilling, “The Kinsey Report,” 221.

²³ See Robert Spaemann, *Persons: The Difference Between ‘Someone’ and ‘Something’* (Oxford: University Press, 2006), trans. Oliver O’Donovan.

²⁴ See Table 34 in Kinsey, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, 180, and Reisman, *Kinsey: Crimes & Consequences*, note 44, 147.

between Kinsey's arguments, SIECUS (supporting early sexual education and freedom for children's sexual expression), and UNESCO (promotion of international sexual education and freedom of children's sexual expression).²⁵

In summary, given the wide-spread exposure of the general public to the Kinsey reports, it is conceivable that many persons began to doubt they were living a healthy or normal life and to reconfigure the usual two ways of being a human person, as male/man or female/woman into some kind of unisex human being along an amorphous continuum.

Margaret Mead's Reduction of Males and Females to Sex and Gender Roles

By 1949, in *Male and Female*, the anthropologist Margaret Mead (1901-1978) claimed that sex-roles or sex-styles were simply culturally learned. In just one example she argued: “

Characteristic after characteristic in which the differences within a sex are so great that there is enormous overlapping are artificially assigned as masculine or feminine.²⁶ Mead's conclusion about the relativism of sex roles and sex identities flowed over into a reflection on the word ‘gender’ itself. She introduced the word ‘gender’ in a discussion about polygamy when she posited the difficulty a person has to imagine contrasts in other societies. In her words: “We know by sad experience how difficult it is for those who have been reared in within one civilization ever to get outside its categories, to imagine, for instance, what a language could be

²⁵Judith A. Reisman, Mary E. McAlister, and Paul E. Rondeau, “Global Sex Deviance Advocacy: The Trojan Horse to Destroy the Family and Civil Society: A Report on UNESCO and International Planned Parenthood Federation,” *Ave Maria International Law Journal* (Spring 2012): Vol 1, no 2: 231-263.

²⁶ Margaret Mead, *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World* (1949), 373.

like that had **thirteen genders**. Oh, yes, one says masculine, feminine, and neuter—and what in the world are the other ten?²⁷” In this hypothetical question, Margaret Mead set the world stage, perhaps unknowingly, for the mutation of gender ideology to begin.

The Medicalization of Gender: Dr. John Money and the Roots of Gender Ideology

Arguing from the Exception to the Rule about Gender Gate

John Money, a young man from New Zealand, who likely knew of Mead’s research his area of the world, came to the United States to complete a doctorate in Psychology at Harvard on the study of hermaphrodites. Soon after his graduation in 1952, Dr. Money was hired at John’s Hopkins university Medical School. His first study in the new Psychohormonal Research Unit was on 131 intersex individuals (persons born with ambiguous biological anatomical sexual characteristics).

In 1955, in the first published paper from Johns Hopkins on this research project, Dr. Money argued directly from the study of hermaphrodites to a conclusion about normal males and females, namely that gender identity is environmentally caused during the approximately ^{first} two years of life:

From the sum total of hermaphroditic evidence ... **the conclusion that emerges** is that sexual behavior and orientation as male or female does not have an innate, instinctive basis. In place of a theory of instinctive masculinity or femininity which is innate, **the evidence of hermaphroditism lends support to a conception that, psychologically, sexuality is undifferentiated at birth and that it becomes differentiated as masculine or feminine in the course of the various experiences of growing up.**²⁸

²⁷ Mead, *Male and Female*, 13. Bold my emphasis.

²⁸ John Money, Doctoral Dissertation on *Hermaphroditism: An Inquiry into the Nature of a Human Paradox*, in John Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl*

Money later called this time frame of approximately two years from birth to the settling of one's sexual and gender identity as a gender gate or gender window.

Twenty years after his original studies, in a text published in 1975, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman*: Dr. Money continued to argue from the exception to the rule:

Convincing evidence that the gender identity gate was wide open when you were born and stayed open for some time thereafter can be found in matched pairs of hermaphrodites... Only a few years from the same sexual start, one of each pair has become a boy, the other a girl. They develop into men and women as different from each other as normal men are different from normal women

But is the gate also open for those who were sexually normal at birth? Transsexuals give the answer—yes.²⁹

Money's method of arguing from the exception (hermaphrodites) to the rule (either male or female) is the first error of reasoning that we encounter in his work. Aristotle recognized long ago, that science of nature recognizes that there are grey areas which do not allow for universal affirmative definitions and AAA syllogisms. Instead, "all science is of that which is always or for the most part."³⁰ So in the situation of hermaphrodites or intersexed human beings, we can see ways in which differentiation as male or female does not naturally happen in some small number of cases, but to argue from them to a theory about all human beings would be fallacious.

The logical error of appealing to hermaphrodites to defend claims about normal human beings in general is also found in the writings of Michel Foucault. Although he only used the

(New York/London/Toronto/Sydney: Harper Perennial, 2000/2001), 33-34. My emphasis.

²⁹ John Money and Patricia Tucker, *Sexual Signatures: On Being a Man or a Woman* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1975), 90-91.

³⁰ Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941).1065a2-6.

word 'sex' rather than 'gender', Foucault considered the concept of one's identity as male or female. He analyzed a personal diary written by Alexina-Herculine Barbin born in 1838. Alexina discovered after puberty that she had developed male anatomy and physiology. His Bishop and a Msgr. together helped Hercule to change civil status from female to male, and to establish himself in Paris with a new male identity. The dynamic and loving community at girl's school where Alexina was preparing to become a teacher, Herculine experienced extreme loneliness, missing those with whom he had been close for around 20 years. The depression led to his suicide in 1868, leaving behind a diary detailing the agony of his life. Michel Foucault's response to the genuine suffering of Alexina/Hercule Barbin was to argue that the categories of sex as either male or female should be abolished for everyone. Foucault's first words in his Introduction are: "Do we truly need a true sex? With a persistence that borders on stubbornness, modern Western societies have answered in the affirmative."³¹ Foucault's approach has the same error Money's, namely arguing from an exception to a general rule.

Dr. Money's research methods, and in particular, his move from a study of hermaphrodites to conclusions about gender identity among normal human beings came under attack from two independent medical research teams: one in 1958 from Kansas and another in 1959 from Toronto.³² When a Canadian couple from Winnipeg with identical twin boys, Bruce and Brian Reimer, born in 1965, had one son (Bruce) lose his penis through a poorly performed

³¹ Michel Foucault, *Herculine Barbin: Being the Recently Discovered Memoirs of a Nineteenth-Century French Hermaphrodite*, (Guillimard, 1978), trans. Richard M cDougall (The Harvester Press, 1980), vii.

³² John Colapinto *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl* (New York/London/Toronto/Sydney: Harper Perennial, 2000/2001), 44-46.

circumcision, they consulted with Dr. Money for help. Dr. Money thought he had found a perfect controlled experiment to prove his gender identity theory: two normal identical male twins where one could be brought up as a boy and the other as a girl. He recommended bringing up the wounded son as a girl surgically, medically, and culturally; and he insisted on not revealing in any way this change to either of the 22 month old children.

Consequently, the wounded child Bruce's name was changed to Brenda, and he was castrated in 1967. In spite of Dr. Money's projected goal of helping this normal male child grow up as a 'normal' female, he/she fought the change continuously. By 1970, Brenda was not adjusting well to being told he was a she. He was normal active boy, a physical fighter, hitting and attacking others, and actually defending his brother. It is at this point that evidence began to manifest itself that Dr. Money cared more for his theory of gender identity/role than he did about the facts; in other words, he was beginning to promote gender ideology. It is a clear characteristic of ideologies that they ignore facts which contradict their theory.

In 1972 a shift from academic professional audiences to broad public audiences occurred when Dr. John Money published, through the Johns Hopkins Press, *Man and Woman Boy and Girl: The Differentiation and Dimorphism of Gender Identity from Conception to Maturity*. In this book, he proclaimed the 'great success of his twins experiment'. Sprinkled through the book Money states proudly, after describing his successes in gender identity-differentiation among human hermaphrodites, "A similar extraordinary contrast has been observed even which a child

born as a normal male was surgically reassigned as a female...[I]n gender behavior, she is quite gender-different from her identical twin brother.”³³

This new book of Money’s was praised on its cover by *The New York Times*: “The Brilliant New Landmark study of human sexuality... The most important work since the Kinsey Reports!”; *Time Magazine* soon followed. The conclusion most often repeated was that sex and gender identity was more due to environmental factors than to genes, anatomy, hormones and other natural factors from conception, birth, and puberty. Money himself “made the case the centerpiece of his public addresses, rarely giving a speech in which he did not mention it.”³⁴

By 1975, Money continued to praise his own success in spite of clear contrary evidence from the Reimer family and especially Brenda. In one example he said: “Dramatic proof that the gender identity option is open at birth for normal infants and that social forces can intervene decisively at least up to a year and a half after birth comes from a few unusual cases such as one that occurred more than ten years ago.”³⁵ And after the decision of the parents to bring up their son as a daughter, Money, continuing to deny the contrary facts reported by the Reimer family: “The girl’s subsequent history proves how well all three of them succeeded in adjusting to that decision.”³⁶

³³ John Money & Anke A. Ehrhardt, *Man & Woman Boy & Girl: The Differentiation and Dimorphism of Gender Identity from Conception to Maturity* (New York and Scarborough, Ontario: New American Library Mentor Book, 1972).19. The text also refers the reader to further details in this case in Chapter 7 of the text)

³⁴ Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 71.

³⁵ Money and Tucker, *Sexual Signatures*, 91. See also Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, chapter 5 and 6.

³⁶ Money and Tucker, *Sexual Signatures*, 95.

In this same year of 1975 Dr. Paul McHugh was appointed psychiatrist-in-chief at Johns Hopkins Hospital. Dr. McHugh requested a systematic study following up of children, especially males who had been transformed into females. Two of these studies of led him to conclude that “re-engineered males were almost never comfortable as females once they became aware of themselves and the world. From the start of their active play life, they behaved spontaneously like boys... and most of those individuals who learned that they were actually genetic males wished to reconstitute their lives as males... and all this despite the earnest efforts by their parents to treat them as girls.” He concluded that “we in the Johns Hopkins Psychiatry Department eventually concluded that human *sexual identity is mostly built into our constitution by the genes we inherit and the embryogenesis we undergo.*”³⁷ In 1978, at the final visit of the Reimers at Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Money introduced 13 year-old Brenda to an adult transsexual, and Brenda fled his office, never to return again. In 1979, Dr. Paul McHugh closed down the gender identity clinic at Johns Hopkins Hospital and soon after moved Dr. Money’s office off campus and limited his teaching.

Through the encouragement of Dr. Mary McKenty, a Psychiatrist in Winnipeg, the parents of the twins were encouraged to tell their 15 year old twin sons the truth about what had happened so many years ago. In March 1980, as soon as Brenda learned the truth, she immediately made the decision to revert to the biological male sex of her birth, and to take the name of David. He felt relief because that truth explained why he had always felt an interior conflict about his identity. Dr. Paul McHugh stated unequivocally in his critique of Dr. Money’s approach. “I have witnessed a great deal of damage from sex-reassignment. The children

³⁷ Paul McHugh, “Surgical Sex” in *First Things* (November 2004): 1-6, here 4..

transformed from their male constitution into female roles suffered prolonged distress and misery as they sensed their natural attitudes. Their parents usually lived with guilt over their decisions—second guessing themselves and somewhat ashamed of the fabrication, both surgical and social, they had imposed on their sons.”³⁸ The harsh reality of human suffering for the Reimer family was not only evident in the parent’s struggle with alcoholism and depression, but In 2002, Brian Reimer died from an overdose of medicine for his mental disease of schizophrenia; and in 2004 David Reimer died from shooting himself in the head after a time of despair. These tragic events reveal a second characteristic of gender ideology, it harmed the innocent.

Dr. John Money never corrected his public position about the gender window or gender gate which he continued to promote and to allow others to promote. He never even averted to the failure of his ‘twins experiment.’ In a publication as late as 1987, Money wrote about “A New Paradigm: Nature/Critical-Period/Nurture,” which is needed to replace nature/nurture conflict.³⁹ In a typical Baconian attitude towards developing human beings, Money states: “Even nature is not inevitably immutable. The genes that govern heredity, the very epitome of nature, can be altered at a critical period by the intervention of nurture in the guise of gene splicing. The alteration then becomes permanent... Formulated in terms of reductionistic biology, nature is a political strategy of those committed to the status quo of sex differences.”⁴⁰

³⁸ Paul McHugh, “Surgical Sex,” 6.

³⁹ John Money, “Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R”, in *Masculinity/Femininity: Basic Perspectives* (New York:/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 14.

⁴⁰ Money, “Diecious G-I/R), 14.

Arguing from Artificial Division Gender-Identity/Role (G-I/R)

The second erroneous argument in John Money's theory about gender can be seen in his introduction in 1972 of definitions of: 'Gender Identity' as private and 'Gender Role' as public.

In his words:

Gender Identity: The sameness, unity, and persistence of one's individuality as male, female, or ambivalent, in greater or lesser degree, especially as it is experienced in self-awareness and behavior; gender identity is the private experience of gender role, and gender role is the public expression of gender identity.

Gender Role: Everything that a person says and does, to indicate to others or to the self the degree that one is either male, or female, or ambivalent; it includes but is not restricted to sexual arousal and response' gender role is the public expression of gender identity, and gender identity is the private experience of gender role.⁴¹

In Chapter 8 of *Man&Woman Boy&Girl* Money tightened up the two phrases into one:...

“‘gender identity’ can be read to mean ‘gender identity/role.’”⁴² In this context the terms ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’ are used to characterize proportions with a person who is more or less masculine or feminine in “vocational and domestic role” and “role as an erotic partner.”⁴³

In 1975, in *Sexual Signatures*, 5, Money repeated verbatim the two definitions above of gender identity and gender role, but this time after referring to gender identity forks that occur during the gender identity gate, he argued that a person “attained your gender identity/role in much the same way as you attained speech.”⁴⁴

⁴¹ Money, *Man&Woman*, 4 and 300-301.

⁴² Money, *Man&Woman*, 153.

⁴³ Money, *Man&Woman*, 153.

⁴⁴ Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 88.

By 1980, in *Love and Love Sickness*, gender identity and gender role became an anagram, G-I/R. John Money made a direct argument against the accusation that his slash between identity and role stands for a Cartesian type dualism:

G-I/R encompasses anything and everything that has to do with behavioral and psychologic differences between the sexes, no matter whether the differences are intrinsically or extraneously related to the genitalia...

It is erroneous to follow the example of some writers who juxtapose sex and gender, allocating sex to the body and what they call biology (as if there is no biology of the mind!) And gender to the mind and social learning, apparently unmindful of the biology of learning. In correct usage, gender is a more inclusive term than sex...⁴⁵

Yet, just three pages later, in Chapter 3: titled "Gender Identity/Role (G-I/R)", Money described the mind in Cartesian terms: "Herein lies the issue of solipsism. Oneself, alone, is privy to what goes on in one's own mind. In the absence of its being overtly transmitted to other people behaviorally, that is to say, either in words or in body language, the content of one's mind remains forever covert and unknown to others."⁴⁶

In an essay entitled: "Alternative Interpretations of the Development of G-I/R" Frank A. Beach raises an important question about Money's division between "the introspective component *gender identity* and his "defined *gender role* as a social script..."⁴⁷ Analyzing another article in which Money makes the same distinctions, Beach states: "Somewhere in the argument the distinction between gender role and gender identity gets lost. I understand that sociologists

⁴⁵ John Money, *Love and Love Sickness: The Science of Sex, Gender Difference, and Pair-bonding*, (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 12.

⁴⁶ Money, *Love and Love Sickness*, 15.

⁴⁷ Beach, "Alternative Interpretations of the Development of G-I/R", 29.

consider gender role as a script imposed on the individual by society. But what happens to gender identity? Is it relegated to Immanuel Kant's category of innate ideas?"⁴⁸

Money will try unsuccessfully to make erotic feelings the link between identity and role.

This false move will be described and critiqued in our next analysis of Money's fourth argument.

Arguing from Multiple Parts (sexes and genders) to the Whole

As early as 1955 John Money described "the sexuality of the individual [as] a cumulative composite of [six] separate sexes."⁴⁹ The six separate sexes were called: Chromosomal sex, Gonadal Sex, Physiological sex, Morphological sex, Behavioral sex, and Psychological sex (gender-role/identity).⁵⁰ From the beginning of his research and publications, Dr. Money used these categories of separate sexes to compare humans with animals and normal humans with hermaphrodites.

In 1987, Dr. Money summarized and praised his earlier views with some additions:

In ordinary, healthy people, the multiple variables of sex, both male and female, correlate perfectly with one another, so that their potential independence of one another is not self-evident. This perfect correlation does not exist in syndromes of hermaphroditism....

In order of appearance, these variables were, as specified in 1955: chromosomal sex, gonadal sex, fetal hormonal sex, internal morphologic sex, and external morphologic sex. In postnatal life, the variables were, successively: assigned sex, sex of reading (including clinical habilitation), and pubertal hormonal sex. Together these variables were

⁴⁸ Beach, 30.

⁴⁹ J. Money, "Hermaphroditism, gender and precocity in hyperandrenocorticism: Psychological findings," *Bulletin of Johns Hopkins Hospital*, (2005) 96, 253-64. As summarized by David Crews, "Functional Associations in Behavioral Endocrinology," in Reinisch, et al, eds., *Masculinity/Femininity*, Chapter 6:83-105, here 91.

⁵⁰ Crews, "Functional Associations", Table 6-2, 91.

held responsible for the differentiation of gender role and orientation (identity) as male, female, or androgynous in the course of growing up. Since 1965, beginning with the 24th edition, *Dorland's Illustrated Medical Dictionary* has incorporated these variables into its definition of sex.⁵¹

In 1972, Money and Ehrhardt had followed the same pattern by sequential sub- titles in the first chapter: Terminology and Nature of Hermaphroditism; Chromosomal and Gonadal Sex; Gonadal, Hormonal, and Morphologic Sex; and Fetal Hormonal Sex, the Nervous System, and Behavior; External Morphologic Sex and Assigned Sex; and Differentiation of Gender Identity; Gender Identity and Pubertal Hormones.⁵² By 1975 Money introduced the concept of 'forks' in the road, which were detours 'selected' by an unborn individual, in the space and time between some of the earlier named sexes: chromosomal sex, gonadal sex, and external genitals, before the letter 'm' or 'f' are put on his or her birth certificate.⁵³

In his summary of "Multivariate Sequential Determinism" Money argues that the "adult status of gender-identity/role (G-I/R) is the culmination of a sequential and multivariate process...". The question that a philosopher must ask is: "What guides this sequential and multivariate process?" In other words, how can an unborn human being, as a collection of different sexes, take a detour or fork when there is no organizing principle within the being? Money has no principle comparable to a substantial form which actualizes potentialities within the developing fetus.

⁵¹ Money "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", 16.

⁵² Money and Ehrhardt, *Man & Woman*, Chapter 1, 6-25. In subsequent chapters further categories included internal genital, external genital, brain dimorphism, and gender dimorphic traditions; 41, 44, 95, 248-49, and 130ff.

⁵³ See Money and Tucker, *Sexual Signatures*, 48-49.

Another clue to Money's goals in these discussions about different sexes within the human being comes from his fascination with lower forms animals and fish. In his 1987 article on "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", Money introduces the theme of "diecious fishes", or fish who sometimes breed as males and other times as female. Then Dr. Money draws his conclusions from lower forms of life for humans:

Once science uncovers the secret of hermaphroditic versatility of sex-changing fish and parthenogenetic lizards, then on the criterion that today's science fiction becomes tomorrow's science, it will undoubtedly be applied to mammals. Thus, one can envisage a future when sex-irreducible G-I/R will no longer be fixed and irreducible, but, by a process equivalent to reverse embryogenesis, it will be sex reversible.⁵⁴

Joined to this postulation of sex-reversible human beings, Dr. Money suggests that the human brain holds both male and female in it. "The two gender schemata, male and female, exist compatibly in the brains of most people, one dominant over the other, their dual presence scarcely recognized."⁵⁵ After discussing some examples which fall outside of the norm, he concludes that in many people the two gender schemas "are now officially classified as topological distinctions, analogous to left-handedness and ambidextrousness."⁵⁶

Two different researchers critiqued the practice of drawing conclusions from animals to humans, as Dr. Money frequently did. The first critique was offered by Dr. Robert J. Stoller, a psychiatrist, who had established a gender identity clinic at the UCLA School of Medicine shortly

⁵⁴ Money, "Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", 18-19. See Frank Beach's argument that Money's theory about the dimorphic brain schemata present in both males and females implies an erroneous leap from the general to the particular, "because his list includes both human and animal behavior...in several cases [where] no such implication appears justified.", "Alternative Interpretations of G-I/R", 33.

⁵⁵ Money, Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", 24.

⁵⁶ Money, Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R", 25.

after Johns Hopkins had established theirs in the late 1950's to early 1960's. Dr. Stoller stated in a 1968 text titled *Sex and Gender: The Development of Masculinity and Femininity*, "We must be careful: Extrapolation from lower animals to humans is exhilarating but dangerous. The mechanisms involved are often too complex to permit this."⁵⁷ The second critique of the same false move came in 1987, from Dr. Frank Beach, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley. Beach stated: "Because [Money's list of nine sex-shared threshold-dimorphic types of behavior] includes both human and animal behavior, he seems to imply shared mechanisms, but in several cases no such implication appears justified./...As we all know, histories and be mediated by quite dissimilar mechanisms."⁵⁸

Proactive Eroticism of Human Relations

The final area of difficulty in Dr. John Money's work on gender identity concerns the continuous promotion of erotic sexual experience, from the beginning of his work to the end of it.. One of the books Dr. Money had co-edited on behalf of the American Psychopathological Association, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior: critical issues in the 1970's*, includes his presentation to the 1970-1971 annual conference, entitled "Pornography in the Home: A Topic in Medical Education." Dr. Money showed explicitly pornographic images to the audience and argued forcefully for the so-called value of sharing of this kind of imagery in schools and homes

⁵⁷ Robert J. Stoller, M.D., *Sex and Gender: Volume II The Development of Masculinity and Femininity* (New York: Jason Aronson, 1968), 8.

⁵⁸ Frank A. Beach, "Alternative Interpretations of the Development of G-I/R," in *Masculinity and Femininity*, 29-36, here 33 and 34.

“into the total context of sex education.”⁵⁹ Dr. Money’s approach to pornography is clearly stated in this professional essay. He argues that exposure to pornographic images, even at a young age, is valuable because they “lead to the possibility of bettering one’s own sex life, leading one to have less guilt and fewer ‘hang-ups’, and more honesty and freedom about sex”; “one becomes better able to help others by achieving a position...of non judgmentalism;” and “satiation effect,...the half-life of pornography...is from about two to four hours out of your total lifetime. So... perhaps you better make sure you’ll enjoy it tonight!”⁶⁰

Dr. Money connected his promotion of childhood exposure to pornography and sex acts to a study of animals. “The chief source of empirical data on juvenile erotosexual rehearsal play is the Wisconsin Regional Primate Center where juvenile rhesus monkeys have been studied.”⁶¹ Drawing his implications from this study where both female and male monkeys deprived of sex play in early life proved unable to mate in later life, Money concluded that “It may well play an extremely influential role as a critical-period phenomenon wherein nature and nurture merge to establish future erotosexual health, male and female.”⁶² The arguments above by Frank Beach can also apply as well to this use of animals for complex human interactions. I would add that the

⁵⁹ Money, “Pornography in the Home,” in Zubin and Money, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 409-440, here, 410.

⁶⁰ Money, “Pornography in the home,” 418-19. October 25, 2012. For a more detailed description of his interactions with the Reimer twins about this theme, see Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 86ff. Money also drew upon some hypotheses (which turned out later to be false) about the value of “sexual rehearsal play” among Australian aborigines, the Yolngu., 88 ff.

⁶¹ Money, “Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R”, 26.

⁶² Money, “Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R”, 26.

dimension of spirit in the human soul provides a completely different capacity for expressions of love than are found in mating among animals.

Money's praise for pornography was also paired with his attack on the Catholic Church—a pattern that repeats itself over and over again. In this essay, his example is called “an allegory of the Crucifixion”. He argues that even though millions of children for two-thousand years have learned at Church on Sunday's about ‘how to commit a crucifixion’, and adds that he has “not heard of children who come home and play crucifixion games with their dolls or playmates.” Money concludes: “Pornography does not automatically have the power to incite behavior.”⁶³ It is clear that Dr. Money does not understand the difference between spirit and the human capacity to love and either human passions or an animal's mating behavior. skip

In this context of considering Dr. Money's proactive approach to the eroticization of relations, we will return for a moment to our previously mentioned case-study of the Reimer twins. During annual visits when Mr. and Mrs. Reimer brought the children to Money's clinic, he encouraged sexual play and took photos of them children in these positions. The twins, during a later interview by John Colapinto said that Dr. Money “would show us pictures of kinds—boys and girls— with no clothes on....; and also showed them pictures of adults engaged in sexual intercourse He'd say to us, I want to show you pictures of things that moms and dads do.”⁶⁴ Dr. Money even suggested that Mrs. Reimer walk around nude at home and that the parents allow their children to observe them having sexual intercourse. They refused to comply to this latter suggestion.

⁶³ Money, “Pornography in the home,” 417.

⁶⁴ John Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 86.

In 1979, after the Reimer family had ended their annual trips to Baltimore for their son, Dr. Money came to Winnipeg to give two lectures at the University Health Sciences Center. He contrived to stay overnight at the home of the Reimer family, much to their discomfort; and both of the twins, now 14 years old avoided him as much as possible. The family only learned later that the lectures Dr. Money had given at the university were on pornography with his usual slides and videos even encouraging incest and group sex.⁶⁵

Even though Dr. Money and the general public continued to herald Dr. Money's 'twins experiment', Dr. Milton Diamond had published serious doubts about 'the twin' case in two journals; he "never deviated from his conviction that sex reassignment of a developmentally normal infant was impossible."⁶⁶ Around this time, the BBC had discovered where the Reimer twins lived and went to school to film for a program called "Open Secret" on medical scandals. After the BBC's report in 1979, Dr. Money just went silent on the Reimer case, but by then it had become part of a 'gender ideology' which had its own trajectory.

Money forged a solid connection between the more general theme of a woman or man's gender identity and erotic experience and sexual orientation; and he publically promoted pedophilia.⁶⁷ In *Sexual Signatures* (1975) Money argued that it is good to encourage children to observe sexual intercourse of adults, and that "the best time to introduce such pictures [The Pictorial Guide to Sexual Intercourse, by Schwenda and Leuchner, 1969] is before a child's

⁶⁵ Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 153-157.

⁶⁶ Colapinto, *As Nature Made Him*, 45ff, 166 ff, 174ff

⁶⁷ John Money, "Interview in *Paidika: The Journal of Paedophilia* (Spring 1991), vol 2. no. 3, p. 5 as reported in Wikipedia, 'On pedophilia,' available at http://wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Money [accessed 12/22/2011].

biological clock has signaled the start of puberty.”⁶⁸ He further argued against the “incest taboo.”⁶⁹ Finally, in this same text, Money argued that it was possible that “all humans are capable of developing a bisexual gender identity/role... and giving it an erotic expression...”⁷⁰

His fascination with multiple varied aspects of the erotic took over more and more of his writings. By 1980, in *Love and Love Sickness: The Science of Sex, Gender Difference, and Pair-bonding*, Money introduced a new field called ‘sexophy. It is defined as: “the body of knowledge that comprises the philosophy, principles, and knowledge that people have about their own personally experienced erotic sexuality and that of other people, singly, and collectively.”⁷¹

Chapter 4 of this book is dedicated entirely to this topic. It begins with a Cartesian-like mental description: “Sexosophy is a new term, coined to fill a lexicographical gap and provide the word we all need to refer to the principles and knowledge people have about their own personal experience of sexual erotic functioning within themselves.”⁷² The very next section is a distorted attack, once again on Religion: titled “Original Innocence, Original Sin”, written just one year after Pope John Paul II began his first audience on the Theology of the Body with the same words

⁶⁸ Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 134.

⁶⁹ Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 182.

⁷⁰ Money, *Sexual Signatures*, 207.

⁷¹ Money, *Love and Love Sickness*, Glossary 223.

⁷² Money, *Love and Love Sickness*, Chapter 4: 43-72, here 43.

but very different meanings.⁷³ Money argues that the culture ‘despoils’ our birthright, treats ‘sex as wicked’ especially in childhood, and severely limits the possibility of gathering empirical evidence on “erotic sexualism as subjectively experienced and reported in childhood.”⁷⁴

By the time Dr. Money wrote his “Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R” in the 1987 Kinsey Institute Series on *Masculinity and Femininity*, he had completely integrated his erotic interests into the definition of Gender-Identity/Role. In his words: “Erotosexually, a G-I/R may be heterosexual, bisexual (androgynous), or homosexual, or it may be transexual or transvestic.”⁷⁵ Here, Money identified five genders as he worked towards the ‘expansion’ of gender ideology.

Summary: Characteristics of the Root of Gender Ideology

To summarize: Dr. John Money’s particular uses of the word ‘gender’ came out of cooperative work of anthropologists, psychologists and surgeons. It was quickly embedded in the respected Johns Hopkins University Medical School with the opening of a Gender Identity Clinic and the transmission of published works through Johns Hopkins University Press.

After a few years it became evident that Dr. Money was promoting a gender ideology because he chose to ignore facts that were contrary to his theory. Specifically he ignored the facts and counter-examples to his claim of success in the ‘twin experiment’ of changing a normal

⁷³ See John Paul II’s General Audience of September 26, 1979, 4:1-5, (The Boundary between Original Innocence and Redemption) in which he argues that Christ appeals to an original state of man and woman before original sin., See *Man and Woman He Created Them: A Theology of the Body*, pp.142-46.

⁷⁴ Money, *Love and Love Sickness*, 43-44.

⁷⁵ Money, *Propaedeutics of Diecious G-I/R*”, 17-18.

male child into an identity as a female. The self-critical mechanisms, so essential to science, were not adequately followed. Money's writings about a gender gate or gender window during the first two years of life, and his general approach to gender identity/role also had several philosophical errors, based on the relation of exceptions to the rule, multiple parts to wholes, division of identity and role, and a hyper eroticization of relationships among adults and children and men and women. None of these errors were corrected over time. Instead they became even more strongly perpetuated.

When an ideology becomes established over a long period of time, it takes on an appearance of truth about reality that seems almost impermeable. We can see that the same thing happened in Ancient Greece, when Aristotle's theory that the female was by nature passive and unable to produce fertile seed (ovulation) for conception, perpetuated what we could call a 'sex polarity ideology' for nearly 2000 years of continuation. Lonergan calls this a general bias that offers a scotoma or blind spot for seeing the truth about reality.⁷⁶ Aristotle's error occurred when science was just beginning; and Money's error occurred just when social sciences were becoming established.⁷⁷ If we can catch the error right away, even though Dr. Money tried to run away from it, and ransom the true meaning of gender reality, there is an opportunity to end the second characteristic that accompanies an ideology, namely, it harms the innocent.

It can be argued that the ideology of sex polarity, based on Aristotle's error about how generation works harmed women over the centuries. It also likely harmed many men and children

⁷⁶ Bernard Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1968), 218-235 and 191-203.

⁷⁷ I am grateful to Dr. Terry Wright for recognizing this comparison of inability to be successfully self-correcting at the beginnings of science and social science.

too. In other words, a 'sex polarity ideology' perpetuated post-Aristotle, that the female was by nature passive and unable to produce fertile seed (ovulation) for conception also harmed the innocent during its two thousand years of perpetuation. In this case the innocent began with women, but also affected many others along the way.⁷⁸

There is no doubt that Money's gender ideology harmed every member of the Reimer family, it harmed the innocent, both children and adults. When Money's books and articles became widely distributed, his promotion of pornography in the home and other aspects of his ideology may have also harmed innocent seminarians and priests along with others who became victims of his proactive eroticism of human relations.⁷⁹

20
minutes

Part II

The Feminization and Politicization of Gender: Gender Ideology 'Goes Viral'

Feminists Adopt the Word 'Gender'

The Sex/Gender System Collapses in on Itself

Catholic Journalists and Attorneys Map World Dimensions of Gender Ideology

Characteristics of the Viral Aspects of Gender Ideology

The Personalization of Gender: Ransoming Gender Reality

The Gift of Theological Anthropology to Gender Reality

Catholic Philosophy's need of Thomistic Metaphysics for Gender Reality

New Evangelization of Gender Reality

⁷⁸ See Sr. Prudence Allen, RSM, *The Concept of Woman* Vols I and II where I demonstrated how this false theory had effects of devaluing women not only in the understanding of human generation but also in areas related to wisdom, virtue, and politics.

⁷⁹ To my great surprise, when I asked our librarians at St. John Vianney Theological Seminary for Inter-Library Loan of four of Dr. Money's books [*Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, *Man&Woman Boy&Girl/Sexual Signatures*, and *Love and Love Sickness*], I found out that they were already in the original St. Thomas Seminary Library, bought at the time of publication in the early 1970's.

Conclusion

The Feminization and Politicalization of Gender: Gender Ideology 'Goes Viral'

Analogous to the way a virus mutates and spreads, in the 1970's and beyond Gender Ideology found for itself willing hosts. "Max Delbruck... described the basic 'life cycle' of a virus in 1937: rather than 'growing', a virus particle is assembled from its constituent pieces in one step; eventually it leaves the host cell to infect other cells."⁸⁰ Furthermore, an introduction to viruses states that "most virus infections eventually result in the death of the host cell...(cell 'suicide')...; and often cell death is caused by cessation of its normal activity..."⁸¹

In this section of the paper on the conflict between Gender Reality and Gender Ideology the ways in which gender ideology 'went viral' will be described.

Feminisms Adopt the Word 'Gender'

In 1970, in chapter two of her book *Sexual Politics* **Kate Millett (1934-)** introduced the term 'gender' and its use first by Robert Stoller with respect to establishing a core gender identity by the age of eighteen months.⁸² Chapter two of this text was drawn from her PhD dissertation on the same topic awarded by Columbia University in 1970. Dr. Millett referred to the California Gender Identity Clinic and some of the studies being done on gender identity there, and she repeats the following distinction of Stoller's: "Gender is a term that has psychological or cultural

⁸⁰ Virology, Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Virology> [accessed 2/6/2012], 1 of 3.

⁸¹ Introduction to viruses, Available from http://en.eikipedia.org/wiki/Introduction_to_viruses [accessed 2/6/12], 1 of 1.

⁸² Kate Millett, *Sexual Politics* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1970), 29.

rather than biological connotations. If the proper terms for sex are 'male' and 'female,' the corresponding terms for gender are 'masculine' and 'feminine'; these latter may be quite independent of (biological) sex."⁸³ In her very next sentence Millett begins "Indeed, so arbitrary is gender, that it may even be contrary to physiology;"⁸⁴ Millett then directly quotes Stoller, who this time includes reference himself to Dr. John Money "...although the external genitalia (penis, testes, scrotum) contribute to the sense of maleness, no one of them is essential for it, not [sic. nor] even all of them together. In the absence of complete evidence, I agree in general with Money, and the Hampsons, who show in their large series of intersexed patients that gender role is determined by postnatal [sic. psychological] forces, regardless of the anatomy and physiology of the external genitalia."⁸⁵ Millett then directly quotes John Money approving his view: "...the condition existing at birth and for several months thereafter is one of psychosexual undifferentiation."⁸⁶

Kate Millett then draws her own feminist evaluation from Money and Stoller's descriptions of gender as socially conditioned. From early on children are conditioned, she argues. "To take a simple example: expectations the culture cherishes about his gender identity

⁸³ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 30, referring back to Robert J. Stoller, *Sex and Gender* (New York: Science House, 1968), 9.

⁸⁴ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 30.

⁸⁵ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 30, referring back to Stoller, *Sex and Gender*, 48, who in turn refers back to J. Money, J.G. Hampson, and J.L. Hampson (1955). "An Examination ... of Human Hermaphroditism" and J. Money, J. G. Hampson, and J. L. Hampson (1957). "Imprinting and ... Gender Role.

⁸⁶ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 30, referring to John Money, "Psychosexual Differentiation," in *Sex Research, New Developments* (New York: Holt, 1965), 12.

encourage the young male to develop aggressive impulses, and the female to thwart her own and turn them inward. The result is that the male tends to have aggression reinforced in his behavior... The same process of reinforcement is evident in producing the chief 'feminine virtue of passivity.'" In contemporary terminology, the basic division of temperamental trait is marshaled along the line of 'aggression is male' and 'passivity is female'""⁸⁷

Millett's book continues to analyze what she identifies as the evils of patriarchy in political, polemical, and literary works and events, divided into two historical periods: 1830-1930 and 1930-1960. In 1966 Kate Millett became a member of the National Organization of Women (NOW), shortly after it was founded.

Another early feminist connection with Dr. Money occurred through Dr. Alice Rossi (1922-2009), who was a founding member of NOW in 1966.⁸⁸ In 1967 Rossi joined the faculty at Johns Hopkins University and in 1969-1974 at Goucher College, both located in Baltimore. It was during this seminal time that in 1970-71 Dr. John Money was "largely responsible for ...a symposium," of the American Psychopathological Association, which brought together scholars

⁸⁷ Millett, *Sexual Politics*, 31-32.

⁸⁸ A step in the rapid spread of gender ideology is found in the collaborative work of Dr. Money; with the previously well-established field of sexology as represented by the Kinsey reports (*Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (1953) and subsequent reports of Masters and Johnson (*Human Sexual Response* (1966) and *Human Sexual Inadequacy* (1970)). All of these elements were in place at the 61st annual American Psychopathological Association Conference sponsored by Johns Hopkins University Medical School in Baltimore in 1970. Dr. Alice Rossi, a moderate feminist, was a participant in this same conference. In 1959 Rossi had been hired to teach full time in Sociology at the University of Chicago.

from the interdisciplinary fields of medicine, psychology, and sociology.⁸⁹ This conference included in addition to the feminist sociologist Alice Rossi, the gynecologist William H. Masters, and the psychologists Virginia E. Johnson, John Money and Saul Rosenzweig. The proceedings of this conference, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior: Critical Issues in the 1970's* published in Baltimore and London in 1973 by Johns Hopkins University Press, lent credibility to the conference and its authors' work. John Money was one of the two editors of the book. The theme of pornography was also front and center in the proceedings at the same time as Money's gender theory gained prominence.⁹⁰ This conference provided a public space for the cross-fertilization of discussions about gender identity, various forms of sex activity, and sex roles. In sort, it provided a complex space for new willing hosts to accept 'gender ideology.'

In the proceedings of the conference in the references to her Chapter on "Maternalism, Sexuality, and the New Feminism," Dr. Rossi cited John Money's research on gender six separate times. In the chapter itself, she states: "With some hesitation, I now plan to attempt a rather wide-ranging extrapolation from the rigorous research of Anke Ehrhardt and John Money (1967; Ehrhardt et al. 1968a,b; Money et al. 1968), by proposing a direction someone will hopefully take from the results of their research on fetal hormone balance impact on subsequent personality and social behavior."⁹¹ Rossi was most interested in how the hormonal balance

⁸⁹ The Symposium was of the 61st annual American Psychopathological Association. Zubin and Money were listed as the 'Committee on Program and the editors of its proceedings published by The Johns Hopkins University Press as *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, xv.

⁹⁰ See Money's earlier mentioned paper arguing for introducing pornography in the home and in sex education, *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 409-440.

⁹¹ Alice Rossi, "Maternalism, Sexuality, and the New Feminism," in *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, chapter 8: 145-173, here 152.

affected different kinds of variations within a particular sex, in this case female, rather than on 'the diagnosis and treatment of abnormality.' She wondered whether the qualities of "high physical energy and psychological toughness... could be triggered by a more-than-usual hormonal balance tipped to androgen excess outside the modal range of female variation?"⁹² Significantly, in this early text Alice Rossi does not use the word 'gender' in her chapter, but limited herself to the word 'sex' when referring to woman's identity. Alice Rossi's seminal work, *The Feminist Papers: From Adams to de Beauvoir*, was published in 1973, when many universities were beginning courses in women's studies and feminist studies. Alice Rossi also gave attention early on to abortion rights for women.⁹³

Ten years later Dr. Rossi gave new prominence to the word 'gender', when in her 1983 Presidential Address to the American Sociological Association, she titles her text "Gender and Parenthood."⁹⁴ Significantly, Alice Rossi adopts the 'word' gender without the ideological meaning (of total social construction) that had been given to it by Money and other theorists. For Rossi and many moderate feminists, gender simply became the commonly used word to describe a woman or a man's identity, including a foundation in biological sex as female or male. In this

⁹² Rossi, "Maternalism", 155.

⁹³ In the conference proceedings Saul Rosenzweig's supported early detection of fetal sex and simple abortion so that "parental choice of neonate sex would become fairly simple", *Contemporary Sexual Behavior*, 202. Rossi also wrote: "Feminists of all political stripes have been united in their insistence on the right of women to control their own bodies, have been sharply critical of masculine assumptions concerning female sexuality, and, hence, have demanded safe contraceptives and abortion repeal...:", 155.

⁹⁴ Alice S. Rossi, "Gender and Parenthood," 1983 Presidential Address, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 49 (February 1984): 1-19.

she affirmed what I will call 'gender reality.' In Rossi's words: "Genes, organisms and environment interpenetrate and mutually determine each other."⁹⁵

In 1983 Alice Rossi attempted to bring a reasonable balance back into the meaning and use of the word 'gender', which had begun to become captured by various ideologies: "Gender differentiation is *not* simply a function of socialization, capitalist production, or patriarchy. It is grounded in a sex dimorphism that serves the fundamental purpose of reproducing the species."⁹⁶ I agree with Rossi's statement of the importance of the male-female sexual differentiation, as the root ground or foundation for gender. Simply stated: the gender of woman is rooted in her female sex and the gender of man is rooted in his male sex always or for the most part. This leaves room for the occasional natural exception without changing the essential meaning of gender differentiation.

In addition to academic lectures and political action, feminists also produced text books using Money's descriptions about gender identity/role; and these provided hosts for gender ideology that spread through out universities across America, Canada, England, Australia, and the English-speaking world. The first example of a textbook is *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* was published in 1978 in the four countries of England, Australia, Canada, and the United States. In the preface its two authors Suzanne Kessler and Wendy McKenna state "Our theoretical position is that gender is a social construction, that a world of two 'sexes' is a result of the socially shared, taken-for granted methods which members use to construct reality. This position is grounded in the ethnomethodological perspective...which asserts that the 'irreducible

⁹⁵ Rossi, "Gender and Parenthood," 11.

⁹⁶ Rossi, "Gender and Parenthood," 11.

facts in which members of a group believe are given their sense of objectivity through the course of social interaction.”⁹⁷

This textbook cites seven different sources authored by John Money; and it incorporates nearly verbatim many of Money’s definitions. In just one example: “Gender identity refers to an individual’s own feeling of whether she or he is a woman or a man, or a girl or a boy, In essence gender identity is self-attribution of gender.”⁹⁸ In addition, even when the authors question some of Money’s claims, they transmit his views about the critical period when gender identity/role is flexible. It also transmits the six ‘sexes’ identified by Dr. Money, but now calls them: “Biologists’ Criteria for Determining Gender: Chromosomes, Gonads, Internal reproductive organs, prenatal hormones, External reproductive organs, Pubertal hormones.”⁹⁹ Finally, the text repeats all the various arguments from cross cultural studies and from animal studies to humans.

The second example of a popular textbook, The Question of Sex Differences: Psychological, Cultural, and Biological Issues was published in the US and Canada the following year, 1979, authored by Katharine Hoyenga and Kermit Hoyenga. Even though the title emphasizes Sex, the content completely adopts Money’s use of terms and definitions:

Gender identity: The sameness, unity and persistence of one’s individuality as male or female (or ambivalent) in greater or less degree, especially as it is experienced in self-awareness and behavior.

Gender role: Everything that a person says and does, to indicate to others or to the self the degree to which one is male or female or ambivalent ...Gender role is the public

⁹⁷ Suzanne J. Kessler and Wendy McKenna, *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach* (New York. Chichester. Brisbane. Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 1978), vii.

⁹⁸ Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*, 8.

⁹⁹ Kessler and McKenna, *Gender*, 64.

expression of gender identity, and gender identity is the private experience of gender role.¹⁰⁰

The Hoyengas changed Dr. Money's list of sexes and genders to a list completely of genders in a chart titled: "Eight Definitions of Gender: Chromosomal Gender, Gonadal Gender, Hormonal Gender, Gender of the Internal Sexual Accessory Organs, Gender of External Genitals, Gender of Rearing, Gender Identity, [and] Gender Role."¹⁰¹ The word 'Gender' has now become transformed into the major category including sex.

To complete this section on how the word 'gender' begins to spread broadly among academic feminists in English-speaking countries, the time line for switching from the word 'sex' to the word 'gender' will be briefly traced in the publications of Alison Jaggar, who was born in England, studied at the University of London, University of Edinburgh, received her PhD University of Buffalo in 1970, and is presently Full Professor with a joint appointment at the University of Colorado Boulder in Philosophy and Gender Studies.

In 1974, Dr. Jaggar first wrote a pathbreaking article entitled "On Sex Equality," which did not include any reference to gender. In a major philosophical anthology *Feminism and Philosophy* (1977), which includes a section entitled "Sex Roles and Gender," and article by Elizabeth L. Beardsley entitled "Traits and Genderization, Jaggar's, "Political Philosophies of Women's Liberation, (a revision of a paper written in 1972) never introduces the word 'gender', but refers only to sex, sex roles, sexuality, and so forth. Then in 1983 Alison Jaggar introduced

¹⁰⁰ Katharine Blick Hoyenga and Kermit T. Hoyenga, *The Question of Sex Differences: Psychological, Cultural, and Biological Issues* (Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1979), 4, referring back to Money and Ehrhardt, *Man & Woman*.

¹⁰¹ Hoyenga and Hoyenga, *Sex Differences*, 5.

the concept of gender in an article entitled "Human Biology in Feminist Theory: Sexual Equality Reconsidered"; and in 1990 Dr. Jaggar co edited with Susan Bordo *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing*.¹⁰² Jaggar exemplifies the way that philosophers followed behind academics in the social sciences in adopting and using the word 'gender' in their professional work. The academics discussed in this section were moderate feminists who laid the ground-work for gender ideology to "go viral". In the next section, the word 'gender' gets infused with more radical meaning which added to its virulence.

The Sex/Gender System Collapses in on Itself

The sex/gender system is rendered incoherent along two different pathways which at times cross over into one another, at other times merge, and other times separate. The pathways can be distinguished in general as follows:

First pathway of collapse: Following a Cartesian mentality, sex is limited to bodily characteristics and gender is limited to social psychological characteristics felt in the mind. This division between mind and body is symbolized by a forward slash as in sex/gender. Over time the 'category' of gender is broadened to include various kinds of sexual activity and medically transgendered human beings. Once this happens, the body enters into gender through the back door, and we begin to get the original two genders, expanded to five, ten, or fifteen including

10 to 15
m. 16 to 18
approx

¹⁰² Alison Jaggar, "On Sex Equality," *Ethics*, 84.4 (July 1974):275-291; and "Human Biology in Feminist Theory: Sexual Equality Reconsidered," in *Beyond Domination: New Perspectives on Women and Philosophy*, ed. Carol C. Gould (New Jersey: Rowan and Allanheld, 1983) 21-24; and Alison M. Jaggar and Susan Bordo, *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing* (New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press, 1989).

variously examples as intersex bisexuals (male or female), homosexuals (male or female), heterosexuals (male or female), transgendered males, transgendered females and so on. So the original separation of bodily sex from gendered identity collapses in on itself.

The second pathway of collapse: Following a post modern or nominalist approach to words and categories, both sex and gender differentiation little by little disappear into the sexless and genderless human, which in turn itself disappears. The identity of the person evaporates and what is left is simply unites of pleasure or pain.

To demonstrate these two ways of collapsing the sex/gender system or distinctions some of the main philosophers who follow this path are briefly described below.

Gayle Rubin (1949-), after completing her MA in Anthropology at the University of Michigan, introduced the phrase 'sex/gender system' in her 1975 article "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex.". Following a Marxist approach, she defined the phrase: I "... call that part of social life the 'sex/gender system' [which] is the set of arrangements by which a society transforms biological sexuality into products of human activity, and in which these transformed sexual needs are satisfied."¹⁰³ Arguing that men traffic in women to satisfy their sexual needs, Rubin argued: "Gender is a socially imposed division of the sexes [into men and women]. It is a product of the social relations of sexuality"¹⁰⁴

Her solution to the so-called division of sexes is to political action to reorganize the sex/gender system towards "the elimination of obligatory sexualities and sex roles. The dream I

¹⁰³ Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in Rayna R. Reiter, *Monthly Review Press* (1995): 157-212, here 159.

¹⁰⁴ Rubin, "Traffic in Women," 179.

find most compelling is one of an androgynous and genderless (though not sexless) society, in which one's sexual anatomy is irrelevant to who one is, what one does, and with whom one makes love."¹⁰⁵ Although Rubin appeared to lean at first more towards a Marxist political interpretation of gender, by 1978 she turned her own life and research towards sado-maschism in a study of and living with gay men and lesbian women in San Francisco. Gayle Rubin completed her PhD in Anthropology for the University of Michigan in 1994 with her doctoral dissertation titled: *The Valley of the Kings: Leathermen in San Francisco 1960-1990*.

Dr. Rubin is presently teaching a course on Foucault in her position as Associate Professor of Comparative Literature and Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Women Studies at the University of Michigan. Our analysis will return briefly to consider Foucault's relation to gender ideology. In *The History of Sexuality* Foucault argued that "sex...[is] an imaginary point determined by the deployment of sexuality."¹⁰⁶ Sexuality ought to displace sex in any analysis of this aspect of human life. He argued further that sex was completely a social construct, and that the 'anchorage points' of "the body, anatomy, the biological, and the functional" should be eliminated in favor of "sexuality."¹⁰⁷ In Foucault's deconstructionist approach, the metaphysical foundation of the human being as composite substance or *hylomorphic* union of soul/body is jettisoned for a floating 'I think' or 'I feel'.

¹⁰⁵ Rubin, "Traffic in Women," 204.

¹⁰⁶ Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Volume I: An Introduction (New York: Vintage Books, 1980, 152.

¹⁰⁷ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 156.

The same year that Gayle Rubin introduced the theme of a sex/gender system, “[i]n the spring of 1975 he [the French **philosopher Michel Foucault 1926-1984**]] plunged passionately into San Francisco’s gay community, attracted especially by the consensual sado-masochistic eroticism that flourished in a number of bathhouses in the Bay City at that time... Foucault now searched for the ‘complete total pleasure,’ the ‘limit experience’ that he associated with death... In fall 1983 Foucault made what would be his final trip to San Francisco... now preoccupied by AIDS and by his own possible death from the deadly disease.”¹⁰⁸ In his *History of Sexuality*, he argued that sex is an illusion, while at the same time he choose to seek purpose or intelligibility of his own identity in its multiple acts. Foucault ‘prophetically’ predicted his own way of death:

The Faustian pact, whose temptation has been instilled in us by the deployment of sexuality, is now as follows: to exchange life in its entirety for sex itself, for the truth and the sovereignty of sex. Sex is worth dying for. It is in this (strictly historical) sense that sex is indeed imbued with the death instinct. When a long while ago the West discovered love, it bestowed on it a value high enough to make death acceptable; nowadays it is sex that claims this equivalence, the highest of all. And while the deployment of sexuality permits the techniques of power to invest life, the fictitious point of sex, itself marked by that deployment, exerts enough charm on everyone for them to accept hearing the grumble of death within it.¹⁰⁹

Since Foucault opened this way of analysis, many feminist writers have applied and developed his theories in relation to contemporary issues about gender. Teresa de Lauretis, in her 1987 text *Technologies of Gender*, claims that gender is the effect produced in bodies by

¹⁰⁸ Grenz, *A Primer on Postmodernism*, 125-26. Grenz refers his reader to the more detailed account of these events in James Miller, *The Passion of Michel Foucault* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993), 27-29 and 253.

¹⁰⁹ Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 156. Grenz, in *A Primer on Postmodernism*, summarizes the sex-acts that Foucault was choosing to undertake at the very same time as he was writing his *History of Sexuality*, 253.

complex political technology which produces technologies of sex, technologies of gender, and socially constructed engendered beings. An expansion of her view is as follows:

The construction of gender goes on today through the various technologies of gender (e.g. cinema) and institutional discourses (e.g. theory) with power to control the field of social meaning and thus produce, promote, and 'implant' representations of gender. But the terms of a different construction of gender also exist, in the margins of hegemonic discourses. Posed from outside the heterosexual social contract, and inscribed in micropolitical practices, these terms can also have a part in the construction of gender, and their effects are rather at the 'local' level of resistances, in subjectivity and self-representation.¹¹⁰

de Lauretis analyzes the various ways in which gender is a product and process of representation, a construction that continues to effect women and men by forming them into concrete individuals. She demonstrates further the ways in which "the construction of gender is also affected by its deconstruction."¹¹¹ de Lauretis concludes with only a partial deconstruction of gender:

We cannot resolve or dispel the uncomfortable condition of being at once inside and outside gender either by desexualizing it (making gender merely a metaphor, a question of *différence*, of purely discursive effects) or by androgynizing it (claiming the same experience of material conditions for both genders in a given class, race, or culture).¹¹²

In 1988 Biddy Martin takes a further step in developing contemporary consequences of Foucault's social construct argument when she states that:

¹¹⁰ Teresa de Lauretis, *Technologies of Gender* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana U. Press, 1987), 18. de Lauretis directly mentions her indebtedness to Foucault: "The essay takes its title and its conceptual premise from Foucault's theory of sexuality as a 'technology of sex' and proposes that gender, too, both as representation and as self representation, is the product of various social technologies, such as cinema, as well as institutional discourses, epistemologies, and critical practices.", ix.

¹¹¹ de Lauretis, *Technologies of Gender*, 3.

¹¹² de Lauretis, *Technologies of Gender*, 11.

For Foucault, the question of the truth of one's sex, of one's self is not a self-evident question, and the answers which literature, medicine, psychiatry and religion provide are, in fact, a matter of rendering our bodies and psyches subject to control. Having created sex and gender as problems of a particular kind, the experts must necessarily intervene in our lives to provide solutions and to bind us within a particular identity, a subjectivity. Woman, as a category of meaning, and women have been subject to the gaze, the interventions, and the control of medical, psychoanalytic, and aesthetic experts who do the work of limiting and regulating what it means to be a woman in line with the exigencies of their own discursive fields and legitimating truths.¹¹³

Martin considers what she perceives as a difficulty of modern feminists, or how to "desexualize the category of woman" at the same time as woman is kept as a starting point for critical reflection on oppressive structures of society. She sees this as the paradox of desexualization and cultural criticism.

Monica Wittig argues that gender is a socially constructed political concept, and therefore that it ought to be deconstructed:

"Man" and "woman" are political concepts of opposition, and the copula which dialectically unites them is, at the same time, the one which abolishes them. It is the class struggle between women and men which will abolish men and women. The concept of difference has nothing ontological about it. It is only the way that the masters interpret a historical situation of domination. The function of difference is to mask at every level the conflicts of interest, including the ideological ones.

In other words, for us, this means there cannot any longer be women and men, and that as classes and categories of thought or language they have to disappear, politically, economically, ideologically.¹¹⁴

Wittig then argues that since sex and gender are socially constructed, they ought to be abolished.

¹¹³ Biddy Martin, "Feminism, Criticism, and Foucault," *Feminism and Foucault: Reflections on Resistance*, eds. Irene Diamond and Lee Quinby (Illinois: Northwestern U. Press, 1988), 14.

¹¹⁴ Monique Wittig, "The Straight Mind," *Feminist Issues*, vol.1 (summer 1980), 108.

However, it is important to note that Wittig introduces a qualification into her deconstructionism. Judith Butler describes it as follows: "...Wittig calls for the destruction of 'sex' so that women can assume the status of a universal subject."¹¹⁵ In this paradoxical move, Wittig seeks to keep some semblance of gender identity at the same time as she is abolishing the ontological grounds for its stability.¹¹⁶ Butler recognizes the serious implications of the deconstructive approach which flows from a theory that gender and sex are only socially constructed:

But once we dispense with the priority of "man" and "woman" as abiding substances, then it is no longer possible to subordinate dissonant gendered features as so many secondary and accidental characteristics of a gender ontology that is fundamentally intact. If the notion of an abiding substance is a fictive construction produced through the compulsory ordering of attributes into coherent gender sequences, then it seems that gender as substance, the viability of *man* and *woman* as nouns, is called into question by the dissonant play of attributes that fail to conform to sequential or causal models of intelligibility.¹¹⁷

Catholic Attorneys and Journalists Map the Gender Ideology Virus

From the 1990's to the present four persons have done a remarkable work in mapping what I have called the 'gender ideology virus' as it traveled through out the world taking root in willing hosts. Two of these mappers are Catholic attorneys, Mary Ann Glendon and Christopher Smith; and two of the mappers are professional Catholic journalists, Dale O'Leary and

¹¹⁵ Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 20.

¹¹⁶ Butler, *Gender Trouble*, states: "Wittig appears to dispute the metaphysics of substance, but on the other hand, she retains the human subject, the individual, as the metaphysical locus of agency.", 25.

¹¹⁷ Butler, *Gender Trouble*, 24.

Marguerite A. Peeters. Their work to alert the rest of us concerning how gender ideology has gone viral is invaluable and provides a crucial foundation for our further thinking and action.

At the same time, I am in disagreement about one aspect of the solution the two journalists suggest to overcome the spread of gender ideology. In brief, they argue that we should avoid using the word 'gender' and instead restrict ourselves to using only the word 'sex.'¹¹⁸ My argument against this position is that the word 'gender', has already become the common word used for man or woman, male or female on applications for airplane flights, visas, universities, and so on. If we are to simply ignore it, just like ignoring a virus, its distorted version of gender ideology will continue to spread, and isolation to simply the word sex will become increasingly ineffective. Instead I will argue that we should attempt to ransom the word gender, much like John Paul II ransomed the word 'feminism' by introducing the 'new feminism' of the true meaning of feminism which is based on the common good of women and of all persons including men and children.¹¹⁹ Before offering some philosophical reasons for ransoming gender reality from gender ideology, I will offer a time-line of the world-wide expansion in gender ideology, with references to the four authors who mapped its expansion.

In 1975, the United Nations organized a world conference in Mexico City for the UN Year of the Woman. In ¹⁹⁷⁴1974, preparations were being made in different regional meetings of Non Governmental Organizations (NGO's). The regional conference for Latin American met in

¹¹⁸ See Dale O'Leary, "Don't Say Gender when you mean Sex." Available from Pontifical Council on the Laity: Women's Section (January-February 2012), 1-5, here 2; and "Interview with Marguerite A. Peeters on the gender theory," Available from Pontifical Council on the Laity: Women's Section (November-December 2011), 1-2.

¹¹⁹ See (Sr.) Prudence Allen, "Ransoming Treasured Words," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, volume CVI, no. 6 (March 2006): 22-29.

plus the
Kinsey
disturb

Mar del Plato, Argentina. At that conference Senora Marta Llama, a Mexican Feminist, proposed a theory of five sexes. Her words sound like a carbon copy of Dr. John Money's theory:

Biology shows that, outwardly, human beings can be divided into two sexes; nevertheless, there are more combinations that result from the five physiological areas which, in general and very simple terms, determine what is called the biological sex of a person: genes, hormones, gonads, internal reproductive organs and external reproductive organs (genitals). These areas control the five types of biological processes in a continuum... A quick but somewhat insufficient classification of these combinations obliges one to recognize at least five biological sexes: men (persons who have two testicles); women (persons who have two ovaries); hermaphrodites or herms (in which there are at the same time one testicle and one ovary); masculine hermaphrodites or merms (persons who have testicles, but present other feminine sexual characteristics; [and] feminine hermaphrodites or ferms (persons with ovaries, but with masculine sexual characteristics).¹²⁰

In addition to this proposal for five equal sexes, Senora Marta Llama also argued that a person's identity as a man or woman is simply socially constructed. She often spoke of gender and defined it as: "the symbolization that each culture establishes over sexual difference."¹²¹

During September 1-4, 1994, representatives from 179 governments around the world met in Cairo for a United Nations Program of Action on a variety of global issues. A large group of NGO's met just before the UN in Cairo. At this conference a rather intense argument erupted over the meaning of the word 'gender' which was frequently used in a draft text. American Congresswoman Bella Abzug, tried to redefine gender, or blur distinctions when others tried to stop her.¹²² Bella Abzug's own words reveal deeper philosophical positions. First, following the

¹²⁰ Marta Llamas, "Cuerpo: Diferencia sexual y género", in Dale O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda: Redefining Equality* (Lafayette, Louisiana: Vital Issues Press, 1997), 69-70.

¹²¹ Llamas, "Cuerpo," in O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 71.

¹²² For a thorough description of the arguments and tactics, see O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 86ff.

line of thought that a woman's body imprisons her previously articulated by Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex*, Abzug rejects the significant place of sexual identity within one's gender identity ["The current attempt by several Member States to expunge the word *gender* from the Platform for Action and to replace it with the word *sex* is an insulting and demeaning attempt to reverse the gains made by women, to intimidate us, and to block further progress."]¹²³

Secondly, the argument about roles echoing Betty Friedan's *The Feminist Mystique* is similarly aggressive: ["We urge the small number of male and female delegates seeking to sidetrack and sabotage the empowerment of women to cease this diversionary tactic. They will not succeed. They will only waste precious time. We will not go back to subordinate inferior roles."]¹²⁴

The difficulty is that Bella Abzug's definition of gender follows the sex/gender Cartesian separation. In her words "The meaning of the word *gender* has evolved as differentiated from the word *sex* to express the reality that women's and men's roles and status are socially constructed and subject to change."¹²⁵ In fact, her political position based on a kind of Cartesian unisex equality promoted abortion rights, the social construction of several sexes and genders. In the end, the 'word' gender was left vague to mean "as it has been commonly used and understood", which was the problem in the first place.¹²⁶

It is at this point that gender ideology proponents sought to dominate the discussion and resolutions at the **United Nations Fourth Conference on Women in Beijing, China in 1995** by

¹²³ See O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 87.

¹²⁴ See O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 87.

¹²⁵ See O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 86-87.

¹²⁶ See O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 159.

redefining equality of men and women to mean statistical equality in every kind of work or political situation. As Dale O'Leary summarized it: "The Gender Agenda begins with a false premise—the differences between men and women are social constructs—and then goes on to demand that this premise be 'mainstreamed' in every program and policy."¹²⁷

At this point I would like to interject two antidotal pieces of information. In the first one, Congressman Chris Smith shared with the audience present at his key note address to the Fellowship of Catholic Scholars in Pittsburgh (2004)¹²⁸, that he had received anonymously a package which listed the ten or so steps that feminists had decided to take to circumvent the difficulty at that time of changing US law so that it would conform to its agenda. Among these steps was the plan to go first to the United Nations and get certain rights approved there (as it was easier to accomplish) and then return to the United States to argue that this country should conform itself to the international precedent established at the UN. Another step in the plan was to insert their own members into the middle tier of administrators, who took the UN policies and its finances out to all the world, and country by country to make sure they could be put in place.

¹²⁷ O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 161.

¹²⁸ Representative Christopher H. Smith (R.-N.J.), Keynote Address "Pro-Family Prospects in the Congress," Chapter 1 in Kenneth D. Whitehead, ed., *The Church, Marriage & the Family* (Notre Dame: St. Augustine's Press, 2007), 1-10. Unfortunately these informal remarks in the context of his lecture are not included in the published written text. It is also worth noting that Chapter 20 in the same published text details the extraordinary negative effect of the "use of rapidly spreading pre-natal sex determination technology for gender-based abortion..." on the world-wide increasing numbers of abortion of female fetuses. See Nicholas Eberstate, "The Global War against Baby Girls An Update," 341-362, here 362.

Chris Smith was at the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing and he worked hard to support the profamily and prolife groups at the conference.¹²⁹

In the second one, Mary Ann Glendon, Harvard Law Professor, addressed in Denver a group of several women about her experience leading the Vatican Delegation to the UN Conference in Beijing. Before going to the conference she told us about meeting with Pope John Paul II to received some of his guidelines for representing the Vatican's Positions on Woman's Identity in the context of the other kinds of forces and arguments which will be present at the conference. Specifically, when she asked him how he might suggest responding to the multiple genders and sexes lobbies, the Holy Father suggested that she just stand up and say something like the following: "That is absurd. We know that men and women are everywhere in the world the two ways of being a human being."

In her written summary of the Vatican Delegation to Beijing, Mary Ann Glendon provides a welcome insight into the mind of John Paul II and to the conclusions of that conference.

... [o]ur assessment of their [the documents of the conference] pros and cons was communicated to the Vatican Secretariat of State. On Thursday morning, we received the Holy Father's decision: Accept what is positive, but vigorously reject what cannot be accepted.

Accordingly, the Holy See delegation associated itself in part, with several reservations, with the conference documents... A controversy over the word "gender" that loomed before the conference had been largely defused with a consensus that gender was to be understood according to ordinary usage in the United Nations context. The Holy See, however, deemed it prudent to attach to its reservations a further, more nuanced, statement of interpretation, in which it disassociated itself from rigid biological determinism as well as from the notion that sexual identity is indefinitely malleable. In keeping with the Holy Father's instruction to vigorously reject what was unacceptable, my concluding statement was sharply critical of the conference documents for the

¹²⁹ O'Leary, *The Gender Agenda*, 193-94.

remaining deficiencies that our delegation had tried from the beginning to publicize and remedy.

The most important political lesson to be taken from the Beijing conference is that huge international conferences are not suitable settings for addressing complex questions of social and economic justice or grave issues of human rights. Unfortunately, there is an increasing tendency for advocates of causes that have failed to win acceptance through ordinary democratic processes to resort to the international arena, far removed (they hope) from scrutiny and accountability... [They] can be expected to keep on trying to insert their least popular ideas into U.N. documents for unveiling at home as "international norms."¹³⁰

In 2006, the Pontifical Council for the Family produced a *Lexicon: Ambiguous and debatable terms regarding family life and ethical questions*. In this lexicon there are two essays on the meaning of 'gender.' In the article called "Gender" by Jutta Burggraf, after tracing the history of the word, the question is left open about whether or not to use the word 'gender'. While not accepting "the ideology of gender", Jutta Burggraf proposes a "gender perspective". She concludes: "This 'gender perspective' that defends the right to differences between men and women, and promotes co-responsibility in work and family, should not be confused with the radical proposal used at the beginning of this discussion, that ignores and crushes the natural differences between both sexes."¹³¹

In the same *Lexicon* Oscar Alzamora Revoredo defines gender in "An Ideology of Gender: Dangers and Scope" drawing from the UN conference in Beijing: "Gender refers to the relations between men and women based on the socially defined roles assigned to one sex or the

¹³⁰ Mary Ann Glendon, "What Happened at Beijing," *Traditions in Turmoil* (Ann Arbor, Michigan, 2006), chapter 37: 301-13, here 310.

¹³¹ Jutta Burggraf, "Gender", in Pontifical Council for the Family, *Lexicon: Ambiguous and debatable terms regarding family life and ethical questions* (Virginia: Human Life International, 2006): 399-408, here 408.

other.”¹³² Then, drawing from his experience of the regional conference at Mar de Plato, Argentina Revoredo cautions: “It becomes clear that the supporters of the gender perspective were advancing something more reckless, like, for example, ‘a natural man or woman does not exist...’”¹³³ These two conflicting positions in the *Lexicon* of ambiguous terms leave the position open for further study and clarification.

The final person to be considered in this section on mapping the virus of gender ideology is Dr. Marguerite A Peeters, Journalist and Director of the Institute of Intercultural Dialogue Dynamics in Brussels, and faculty member of the Urbaniana Pontifical University. Dr. Peeters has written extensively on the ideology of gender and is at the forefront of mapping its intellectual and political expansions. In 2006, in the proceedings of a study seminar sponsored by the Vatican in 2004, Marguerite Peeters stated that:

The concept of gender breaks the ontological unity of the human person by separating the body from an individual’s personal vocation as a man or a woman, a father or a mother, a husband or wife, a son or daughter; it breaks down the Trinitarian image of the human person. It therefore opens the floodgates to every type of possible choice regarding sexual orientation: bisexuality, homosexuality, lesbianism, heterosexuality, all of which are choices that the new ethical system places on the same plane in a form of radical moral relativism.

The deconstruction of the person as a man or as a woman leads to a sexless society, a society without tenderness, a “neutral society without men and without women.”¹³⁴

¹³² Oscar Alzamore Revoredo defines gender in “An Ideology of Gender: Dangers and Scope” in *Lexicon*: 465-482, here 466.

¹³³ Revoredo, “An Ideology of Gender,” 467.

¹³⁴ Marguerite A. Peeters, “Current Proposals and the state of the debate,” Pontificium Consilium Pro Laicis: Laity Today, *Men and Women Diversity and Mutual Complementarity* (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2006):73-98, here 80. My emphasis.

From my perspective, Dr. Peeters is describing the ideology of gender and not the concept of gender itself. Nonetheless, her article very well maps the strategy of “gender mainstreaming, from 1968 Teheran, 1974 Bucharest, 1975 Mexico City, 1980 Copenhagen, 1985 Nairobi, and 1995 Beijing.”¹³⁵ Her work is an invaluable reference for the viral spread of gender ideology. Peeters correctly identifies that “In the gender revolution, the real power is wielded by experts... [who] are given direct access to senior civil servants and all the real decision-makers in every country, in order to be able to exert their influence without hindrance.”¹³⁶ And she prophesies correctly that “The gender revolution is spreading like wildfire, albeit silently, without any form of public debate, and without anyone feeling the need to give it any democratic legitimacy.”¹³⁷

In *The globalization of the western cultural revolution: key concepts, operational mechanisms* Marguerite Peeters elaborates in detail her basic approach to gender. While her mapping of the globalization of gender ideology is excellent, I still disagree with her conclusion to avoid the word ‘gender’ altogether and so will add the bracket [ideology] in my description of her arguments. Peters identifies a ‘gender paradigm’ supported by ‘gender feminists’ who “have established a dialectical distinction between the concept of sex, feminine or masculine, whose differences are written in biology and are therefore unchangeable, and gender, feminine or masculine, whose differences, according to them, are socially constructed, unstable, and changeable.”¹³⁸

¹³⁵ Peeters, “Current Proposals,” 85.

¹³⁶ Peeters, “Current Proposals,” 95.

¹³⁷ Peeters, “Current Proposals,” 96.

¹³⁸ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 71.

Peeters analyzes the rights- based approach strategy of gender [ideology]: “The first is the integration into human rights of the objectives of the erotic revolution... The second is the integration of socioeconomic development into human rights...;...and the post-modern right to choose.”¹³⁹ She traces the Gender [ideology] mainstreaming at the UN and its use of “global gender [ideology] specialists through the UN’s Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women, or OSAGI.”¹⁴⁰ In addition, Marguerite Peeters correctly describes a new battleground for gender ideology vs. gender reality in the field of education through a clear agenda from UNICEF for transforming schools in five stages: gender sensitive; gender healthy; gender priority to girl’s education, gender rights of children to express their opinions and to have access to sexual and reproductive health; and evaluation on the children’s positive participation in society.¹⁴¹

In 2008, Marguerite A. Peeters gave a lecture entitled “Gender: an anthropological deconstruction and a challenge for faith” at a conference sponsored by the Pontifical Council for the Laity in Rome on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of *Mulieris Dignitatem*. This lecture begins with the strong claim: “Gender is one of the most harmful categories in the feminist, sexual and cultural revolution that we are experiencing in the West.”¹⁴² Here again, Peeters used

¹³⁹ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 88-89.

¹⁴⁰ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 131-133.

¹⁴¹ Peeters, *The Globalization*, 161-62.

¹⁴² Marguerite A. Peeters, “Gender: an anthropological deconstruction and a challenge for faith”, in Pontifical Council for the Laity, *Woman and Man the humanum in its entirety* On the 20th anniversary of John Paul II’s Apostolic Letter *Mulieris Dignitatem*. 1998-2008) (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2010): 289-299.

the word 'gender' without the qualifier 'ideology.' Later in her presentation, Peeters argues further that "gender is not an ideology in the proper sense of the term," because it did not flow from a master who created it like Marx and from a systematic great theory. Following this, she states that "Gender carries in its wake residue from feminism and Marxism..."¹⁴³. And, later on in her article, Peeters refers to gender ideology's attack on mothers and on 'man-woman complementarity.' Finally, she returns to her simple use of the word 'gender' and concludes that "The concept of gender has the revolutionary objective of restructuring society according to a new model of gender equality."¹⁴⁴ Unfortunately, in this article Peeters goes back and forth between using gender on its own and occasionally introducing the qualifier ideology of gender. It would seem that she still maintains that even the word 'gender' always carries with it all the residue of gender ideology.

I was present at this conference, and in a public discussion I raised the question about whether we could ransom 'gender' because it was our word from the beginning with its root in Aristotle's generation of animals and in the book of *Genesis* in Scripture before it became kidnaped and distorted. It seemed to be at the time that Peeters especially polarized equality with what she called an anthropological complementarity between woman and man. She tended to argue that equality made anthropological complementarity impossible. In my defense of integral gender complementarity (which is a metaphysical theory before it is anthropological), equality of dignity and worth of man and woman is one of its two essential characteristics along with significant differentiation qua man and qua woman as the second essential characteristic.

¹⁴³ Peeters, "Gender", 290.

¹⁴⁴ Peeters, "Gender", 297.

The Council for the Laity: Women's Section has left the debate about gender open by being willing to post articles written against the use of the word 'gender' by Dale O'Leary and Marguerite Peeters along side with articles written by me in which I use the word 'gender' in the sense of gender reality.¹⁴⁵ With the increasing urgency that Peeters and O'Leary are expressing concern about using the word 'gender' it is time to directly make the case for us to ransom its use as part of the new evangelization in this year of Faith.

Characteristics of Gender Ideology 'going' viral

Gender Ideology seeks to dominate through the exercise of power. Its chosen host was the United Nations conferences and organizations. Its method was to attempt to subvert equal participation among those present. Gender Ideology rejects reasoned arguments based on a real understanding of the human person. It provided artificial separation of mind from body and then incoherently brought sexual relations back into gender identity through sexual activity.

The Personalization of Gender: Ransoming Gender Reality

Through the years I have made detailed arguments in support of a theory of integral gender complementarity. Briefly summarized, this theory argues that women and men are fundamentally equal in dignity and worth and significantly different; and they are called into

¹⁴⁵ For example, they posted an article by Peeters entitled: "A New Global Ethics. Challenger for the Church, and an interview with Marguerite A. Peeters on the gender theory." They also posted articles by Dale O'Leary on "A Woman's Perspective on Mainstreaming a Gender Perspective," and "Don't Say Gender when You Mean Sex. And during the same time frames they posted articles by me which use gender to mean basically woman and man as the two ways of being human, in *Mulieris Dignitatem* twenty years later; an overview of the document and challenges and Man-Woman Complementarity: The Catholic Inspiration. All Available at www.laici.va/content/laici/en/sezioni/donna/articoli.html

synergetic relations of love and friendship that are biologically and/or spiritually generative. The framework for this theory is drawn from neo-Thomism in its development in existential Thomistic personalism especially as elaborated by Karol Wojtyla/John Paul II.

The Gift of Theological Anthropology to Gender Reality

Fides et ratio encourages philosophers to test out the truth of their theories by the anchor of revelation. In the controversial sets of arguments about gender, we are very fortunate to have a clear and unambiguous revelation in *Genesis* that God created human beings one of two and only two genders, as male and female; and he called them into a union that he mandated to be fertile: "Go forth and multiply and fill the earth." This revelation to philosophers sets the boundaries for our thought in a very rich way. Pope John Paul II, in his audiences on the Theology of the Body and in his subsequent development in *Mulieris Dignitatem* summarized that man and women are equally human, that they are equally persons, and that they are significantly different as complementary to one another. These are the two components of the philosophical theory of integral gender complementarity.

The word 'integral' means that each woman and each man is a whole person, not a fraction of a person, and the word 'gender' includes reference to a sexual starting point as female or male and to the kind of woman or man that a person develops through his or her acts. A person integrates his or her soma, psyche, consciousness, through acts of will and intellect that build on the real potentialities that are present from the start.

Catholic Philosophy's need of Thomistic Metaphysics for Gender Reality

Thomas Aquinas understood that the human soul has a dual identity; it acts as the form of the body when it organizes it, and it acts as spirit when it is in communication with other spirits. This means that any attempt to define the full meaning of human love between a woman and a man, by a direct analogy with animals is doomed to failure.

Furthermore, without a metaphysical foundation that is open to contemporary science it is not possible to explain how integration occurs within a woman or a man without descending into pure capricious choice as has been brought to our attention earlier in this paper. Bernard Lonergan and M.A. Krapiec. If we think of each human being as having a central substantial form which organizes several hierarchically integrated conjugate forms, we can better understand how a woman's identity or a man's identity is stable and yet open to spiritual love. Lonergan offers the following description of this complex structure of the human being in *Insight*:

Organic, psychic, and intellectual development are not three independent processes. They are interlocked with the intellectual providing a higher integration of the psychic and the psychic providing a higher integration of the organic. Each level involves its own laws, its flexible circle of schemes of recurrence, its interlocked set of conjugate forms. Each set of forms stands in any emergent correspondence to otherwise coincidental manifolds on the lower levels. Hence, a single human action can involve a series of components, physical, chemical, organic, neural, psychic, and intellectual, and the several components occur in accord with the laws and realized schemes of their appropriate levels.¹⁴⁶

Sex and gender identity appears in different ways in these complex levels of organization of an individual's identity. Various sciences are uncovering the remarkable complexity of sexual and gender differentiation in many ranges.

Karol Cardinal Wojtyla elaborated in his work *Love and Responsibility* a complex ethical

¹⁴⁶Lonergan, *Insight*, 470.

system that directly focuses on sexually differentiated interaction. In this text, the personalistic focus of a woman or man's identity as being developed by acts from within is repeatedly emphasized:

[A]ffirmation of the value of the person can only be the product of the spirit, but the effort is above all positive and creative 'from within', not negative and destructive. It is not a matter of summarily 'annihilating' the value 'body and sex' in the conscious mind by pushing reactions to them down into the subconscious, but of sustained long term integration; the value 'body and sex' must be grounded and implanted in the value of the person¹⁴⁷.

The understanding of the person as a "psycho-somatic unity that achieves integration precisely through acts of self-governance and self-determination is developed in considerable detail in the text *The Acting Person*. Thus, we build ourselves up to be a particular kind of woman and of many through decisions and acts which build on the somatic foundation we have.

To follow out the logic of integral gender complementarity that permeates the work of Karol Wojtyla/ Pope John Paul II, even though he did not use the word gender, it is important to note that in *Love and Responsibility*, he identified the root of a woman's genius in the fact that through her cycles she ovulations nearly every month from puberty until menopause. This prepares her body to receive new life and it gives her a propensity to receive the life entrusted to her and to foster its growth. As Aristotle said so long ago, a woman generates in herself. A woman can act against this root of her feminine genius by using birth control that represses ovulation or by having an abortion. So it is not a biological determinism, but rather a gift of her sexual identity that offers her a real potentiality to actualize as she develops her genius in her relations with those in her sphere of activity. John Paul II said further that a in maternity

¹⁴⁷ Karol Cardinal Wojtyla, *Love and Responsibility* (London: Collins, 1982), 171.

(biological and/or spiritual) she discovers the meaning of her femininity. He always reserves the word 'feminine' for a woman, any woman's way of acting in the world. He never attributes masculinity to a woman.

Analogously, Pope John Paul II suggests that a man has to make a willed choice to adopt a woman and a child as his own (as did St. Joseph) because he is outside of the process of gestation and giving birth. As Aristotle said, a man generates outside of the self. Drawing from his Apostolic Letter on St. Joseph, it seems as though, once a man makes this willed choice to adopt his wife and to adopt his child, then he has a propensity to protect and to provide for them. Again a man can, and sadly often does, act against this propensity. But if he acts instead to support it, John Paul II suggests that a man discovers the meaning of his masculinity in biological/and or spiritual fatherhood. Also he never attribute feminine characteristics to a man.

Just from this brief description of the integrated way that Personalistic philosophy provides a way to integrate sex and gender, while always respecting the spiritual faculties of intellect and will we can see that it provides the way to ransom gender and the theory of integral gender complementarity. Dietrich von Hildebrand was the first philosopher to state that a husband and wife are metaphysical complements. He understood the significance of the metaphysical foundation to hold up the structure of gender reality. St. Edith Stein identified the importance of ovulation in a woman's identity, and Karol Wojtyla drew out the spiritual gifts that this sexual foundation of a woman's nature offers to her and to the world.

New Evangelization of Gender Reality

In conclusion, I would argue that we need to newly evangelize the meaning and use of the word 'gender' because the concept belongs to us from the beginning, in *Genesis* and in the *Generation of Animals*. It means from its root 'gens' to breed, to generate, to engender, and it demands the collaborative gifts of a woman and a man in union with God. It the way we, as man and woman were created by God and mandated to multiply and fill the earth.

It is perhaps not surprising that it took nearly 2000 years for Aristotle's error that woman provided no fertile seed to be corrected, and her contribution of ovulation to be confirmed. The centuries of denying this reality even in the face of contrary evidence was due, in part, to the pervasive presence of another ideology. It is also significant that today so much effort to promote artificial means of birth control and abortion is being pushed by another form of ideology, gender ideology.

In this year of faith, let us not abandon the struggle for gender reality, and the true meaning of our identities as women and men.



1. The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. This is essential for ensuring the integrity of the financial system and for providing a clear audit trail. The document emphasizes that every transaction, no matter how small, should be properly documented and recorded.

2. The second part of the document outlines the procedures for handling cash and other assets. It stresses the need for strict controls and oversight to prevent any misappropriation of funds. The document also discusses the importance of regular reconciliations and the role of the accounting department in this process.

3. The third part of the document addresses the issue of budgeting and financial planning. It highlights the need for a realistic and well-defined budget that takes into account all potential risks and uncertainties. The document also discusses the importance of monitoring and controlling expenses to ensure that the organization remains within its budget.

4. The fourth part of the document discusses the importance of transparency and communication in financial reporting. It emphasizes that all financial information should be presented in a clear and concise manner, and that any potential issues or discrepancies should be promptly reported to the appropriate authorities.

5. The fifth part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. This is essential for ensuring the integrity of the financial system and for providing a clear audit trail. The document emphasizes that every transaction, no matter how small, should be properly documented and recorded.

